Vigiliae Christianae

A Review of Early Christian Life and Language

VOLUME L

E.J. BRILL
Leiden-New York

Editors-in-chief

J. den Boeft, Amsterdam
R. van den Broek, Utrecht
A.F.J. Klijn, Groningen
G. Quispel, Utrecht
J.C.M. van Winden, Leiden

Associate Editors

. Anastos (Los Angeles) – A. Davids (Nijmegen) – R.M. Grant (Chicago)
Marguerite Harl (Paris) – J.-P. Mahé (Paris) – Elaine Pagels (Princeton) –
D.T. Runia (Leiden) – R. Staats (Kiel)

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

ISSN 0042-6032

CONTENTS

I. Articles

Brown Tkacz, C., *Labor Tam Utilis*: The Creation of the Vulgate 42
De Conick, A.D., The *Dialogue of the Savior* and the Mystical Sayings of Jesus 178
Drijvers, H.J.W., Early Syriac Christianity: Some Recent Publications 159
Folliet, G., La tradition latine des *Septem capitula Abbatis Moysi* 200
Gasti, F., Cicerone in Isidoro: A Margine di *Etym.* 11, 1, 39 387
Hunink, V., Apuleius and the "Asclepius" 288
Jacobson, H., Nonnulla onomastica 210
Kinzig, W., Asterius, Homilie 31 (Richard), Neuedition, Übersetzung, Kommentar 401
Lona, H.E., Zur Bedeutung von ἀβαναύσως in I Clem 44, 3 5
Mahé, J.-P., Preliminary Remarks on the Demotic *Book of Thoth* and the Greek *Hermetica* 353
Meijering, E.P., Zur Echtheit der Dritten Rede des Athanasius Gegen die Arianer (*Contra Arianos* III 1) 364
Nodes, D.J., Rhetoric and Cultural Synthesis in the *Hexaemeron* of George of Pisidia 274
O'Keefe, J.J., Christianizing Malachi: Fifth-Century Insights from Cyril of Alexandria 136
Petersen, W.L., A New Testimonium to a Judaic-Christian Gospel Fragment from a Hymn of Romanos the Melodist 105
Piras, A., Textkritisches zu Augustins *In epistulam Iohannis ad Parthos tractatus decem* 266
Poorthuis, M., Who is to blame: Adam or Eve? A possible Jewish source for Ambrose's *De paradiso* 12, 56 125
Rives, J.B., The Blood Libel against the Montanists 177
Quispel, G., Valentinus and the Gnostikoi 1
Quispel, G., The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic 327
Schüngel, P., Gnostische Kontra Neutestamentliche Soteriologie. Zu Valentins viertem Fragment 257
Scourfield, J.H.D., The *De Mortalitate* of Cyprian: Consolation and Context 12
Teitler, H.C., History and Hagiography: The *Passio* of Basil of Ancyra as a Historical Source 73

TKACZ, *see* BROWN
VAN DEN HOEK, A., Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods 223
WHEALEY, A., Hippolytus' Lost *De universo* and *De resurrectione*: Some New Hypotheses 244

II. REVIEWS

BAARDA, T., *Essays on the Diatessaron* (W.L. Petersen) 215
BALTES, M., *Der Platonismus in der Antike. Begründet von H. Dörrie. Band IV* (J.C.M. van Winden) 420
BOESE, H., *Anonymi Glosa Psalmorum ex traditione seniorum II* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 218
BUTTERWECK, C., *"Martyriumssucht" in der Alten Kirche? Studien zur Darstellung und Deutung frühchristlicher Martyrien* (G. Buschmann) 212
CARLINI, A., *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII. Erma: Il Pastore (Ia-IIIa visione)* (A. Hilhorst) 417
CAROZZI, C., *Eschatologie et Au-delà. Recherches sur l'Apocalypse de Paul* (A. Hilhorst) 94
DECHARNEUX, B., *L'ange, le devin et le prophète: chemins de la parole dans l'œuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie dit "le Juif"* (D.T. Runia) 428
DEKKERS, E. et GAAR, A., *Clauis Patrum Latinorum, ed. 3* (M. Geerard) 419
DÖRRIE, *see* BALTES
FREDE, H.J., *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel 4. Auflage.* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 219
GAAR, *see* DEKKERS
GAMBLE, H.Y., *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (T.M. Teeter) 426
GIBSON, S. and TAYLOR, J.E. *Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre* (J.W. Drijvers) 99
GNILKA, C., *Chrêsis. Die Methode der Kirchenväter im Umgang mit der antiken Kultur* (M. Schrama) 311
GRANT, R.M. and MENZIES, G.W., *Joseph's Bible Notes (Hypomnestikon)* (J.C.M. van Winden) 425
GRYSON, R., *et alii, Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 218
HAYKIN, M.A.G., *The Spirit of God. The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century* (J. van Oort) 80
HILTBRUNNER, O., *Kleines Lexikon der Antike* (J. den Boeft) 316
KASSER, *see* CARLINI

LARDET, P., *L'Apologie de* Jérôme contre Rufin (G.J.M. Bartelink) 416
MANSFELD, J., *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled Before the Study of an Author or a Text* (J. Dillon) 323
MARCOVICH, M., *Lustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis* (J.C.M. van Winden) 81
MARCOVICH, M., *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus* (J.C.M. van Winden) 310
MCCARTHY, C., *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron* (W.L. Petersen) 89
MENZIES, *see* GRANT
MEIJERING, E.P., *Die Geschichte der christlichen Theologie im Urteil J.L. Mosheims* (J.C.M. van Winden) 101
MÜHLENBERG, E., *Gregorii Nysseni Oratio Catechetica* (J.C.M. van Winden) 424
MUNIER, C., *L'Apologie de Saint Justin, Philosophe et Martyr* (J.C.M. van Winden) 81
MUNIER, C., *Saint Justin, Apologie pour les Chrétiens* (J.C.M. van Winden) 309
O'DONNELL, J.J., *Augustine, Confessions* (J. den Boeft) 84
PRAET, D., *De God der goden. De christianisering van het Romeinse Rijk* (J. den Boeft) 318
SATRAN, D., *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 88
SCHOLTEN, C. *Antike Naturphilosophie und christliche Kosmologie in der Schrift "De opificio mundi" des Johannes Philoponos* (J.C.M. van Winden) 423
SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, E., *Gregorius Eliberritanus, Epithalamium sive Explanatio in Canticis Canticorum* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 218
SFAMENI GASPARRO, G. (ed.), *Ἀγαφὴ ἐλπίς. (Studi storico-religiosi in onore di Ugo Bianchi* (survey) 102
SPEYER, W., *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (J. den Boeft) 317
TAYLOR, *see* GIBSON
Vetus Latina 12 (Pars II) Esaias fasc. 3 and 4 219
WILLIAMS, D.H., *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Arian-Nicene Conflicts* (J. den Boeft) 315
YSEBAERT, J., *Die Amtsterminologie im Neuen Testament und in der Alten Kirche* (A.A.R. Bastiaensen) 318
Books received 221, 325, 432

"UNSERE HÄNDE DEN ARMEN ÖFFNEN"
DAS *OPUS MONASTICUM* DER PACHOMIANER

VON

CHRISTOPH JOEST

Es ist erfreulich, daß der große ägyptische Mönchsvater Pachom (287-347)[1] auch unter protestantischen Autoren zunehmend in seiner Bedeutung erkannt und gewürdigt wird. Heinrich Holze geht in seiner Habilitationsschrift "Erfahrung und Theologie"[2] mehrfach mit großem Verständnis für seine Leistung auf ihn ein und hat auch einige wertvolle Aufsätze über den Stellenwert der Heiligen Schrift und die Gebetspraxis bei den Pachomianern veröffentlicht.[3]

Dabei beruft er sich mehrfach auf einen Text der Pachom-Vita, der scheinbar das *opus monasticum* der Mönche, also die Grundpfeiler monastischen Lebens, in klassischer und aus anderen Zusammenhängen genugsam bekannter Weise enthält: unablässiges Gebet, Nachtwachen, "Meditation" des Gesetzes Gottes und Handarbeit.[4] Das Besondere der Leistung Pachoms, so könnte man schlußfolgern, bestünde dann darin, daß er diese Weisungen zum ersten Mal formuliert hat.

Es ist meine Überzeugung, daß der fragliche Text, wenn man ihn so versteht, seiner eigentlichen Pointe beraubt wird, weil er von dem Klosterwesen späterer Zeit rückwärts gewandt betrachtet und von diesem Verständnis aus begriffen und eingeordnet wird. Im folgenden will ich zunächst das Zitat im Zusammenhang der Argumentation bei Holze darstellen, dann die erwähnte Stelle im vollen Wortlaut und im Kontext der Pachom-Vita untersuchen und abschließend das spezifisch Pachomianische aufgrund des behandelten Textes aufzeigen.

Ein verkürztes Zitat

In dem früheren Aufsatz widmet sich Holze der gemeinsamen Gebetspraxis im koinobitischen Leben und ihrem Verhältnis zur individuellen Gebetserfahrung der einzelnen Mönche. Meisterhaft arbeitet er heraus, daß sich beides nicht ausschloß; vielmehr wußte Pachom die individuelle Gebetspraxis

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

der Anachoreten: nämlich Rezitation der Heiligen Schrift während der Handarbeit, unterbrochen von kurzen spontanen Orationen, zu denen der Mönch sich erhob oder niederwarf, mit der Praxis eines gemeinsamen, von allen zusammen vollzogenen Gebets zu verbinden.

In diesem Zusammenhang heißt es bei Holze: "In einer 'Vita' wird von Pachom das Wort überliefert: 'Die Dinge, die uns geboten sind, sind das unaufhörliche Gebet, die Nachtwachen, die Meditation des Gesetzes Gottes und unsere Handarbeit.' Der tabennisische Mönchsvater nennt damit die vier wichtigsten Aspekte des könobitischen Lebens."[5]

Zunächst scheint dieses Wort in der Tat wie eine Zusammenfassung der gesamten Fragestellung zu klingen. Unablässiges Gebet, verbunden mit der den Geist sammelnden Handarbeit, war ein Kennzeichen des anachoretischen wie des koinobitischen Lebens im Sinne Pachoms. So erklärt sich auch der eigenartige Brauch der Pachomianer, selbst während der gemeinsamen *collecta maior* im Oratorium Matten und Seile zu flechten.[6] Ja, gerade hierin zeigt sich der Übergang vom immerwährenden Gebet der Eremiten zu den späteren Tageszeitgebeten der Klöster in besonders charakteristischer Weise, weil die Handarbeit hier in das *Gemeinschaftsgebet* hineingenommen wurde, während sie bei den Anachoreten dazu diente, das *einsame Gebet* zu unterstützen und nur von kurzen Anrufungen unterbrochen wurde.

In seinem zweiten Aufsatz behandelt Holze "Schrifterfahrung und Christuserkenntnis im pachomianischen Mönchtum."[7] Bezeichnend ist der Bezug auf *Erfahrung*, weil es im pachomianischen Mönchtum nicht um die Herausbildung einer intellektuellen Schultheologie ging, sondern um den täglichen praktischen Umgang mit der Heiligen Schrift, konkret: um das beständige halblaute Aufsagen von Psalmen, Evangelien und anderen biblischen Texten. Genau dies: das wiederholende murmelnde Rezitieren, wird in den alten Quellen *meditatio* genannt[8] und ist ebenfalls aus der Praxis des Anachoretentums bereits bekannt.

Mit fast denselben Worten wie zuvor führt Holze an dieser Stelle das bereits genannte Zitat an: "In einer 'Vita' wird von Pachom das Wort überliefert: 'Die Dinge, die uns geboten sind, sind das unaufhörliche Gebet, die Nachtwachen, die 'Meditationen' des Gesetzes Gottes und unsere Handarbeit.' In diesem Wort nennt Pachom die vier elementaren Aspekte des könobitischen Lebens."[9]

Auch hier fügt sich das Zitat bestens in den Argumentationszusammenhang und untermauert ihn eindrücklich. Hier wie dort werden die aufgezählten monastischen Tätigkeiten mit dem bestimmten Artikel "die" vier wichtigsten bzw. elementaren Aspekte des koinobitischen Lebens genannt.

Einerseits wirft das natürlich die Frage auf, ob diese Aufzählung wirklich vollständig sein kann. Fehlt da nicht z.B. der Gehorsam, den die Anachoreten als charakteristisches Unterscheidungsmerkmal des koinobitischen Lebens im Vergleich zu ihrem eigenen Leben sahen?[10] Müßte nicht das Gemeineigentum als kennzeichnende Form der gemeinsamen Armut erwähnt sein?[11] Wäre nicht die Nennung der Regel zu erwarten, wenn es um "die" wichtigsten Aspekte des gemeinsamen monastischen Lebens gehen soll?[12]

Andererseits würde Pachom selbst in diesen Dingen wohl kaum das wichtigste Unterscheidungsmerkmal seiner "Koinonia" im Vergleich zum Eremitentum seiner Zeit gesehen haben.[13] Denn in der Tat: die Aufzählung ist nicht vollständig, weil das Pachom-Zitat nicht vollständig wiedergegeben ist! Es rächt sich hier, daß Holze diese Stelle aus zweiter Hand zitiert. Er findet das Pachom-Wort bei H. Bacht,[14] der es bereits in dieser verkürzten Gestalt anführt. Schon bei ihm wird der Text von einem späteren Standpunkt aus rückwärts gewandt betrachtet und unter ihm fremden Gesichtspunkten verstanden und eingeordnet.

Das vollständige Wort Pachoms

Im ursprünglichen Kontext der Pachom-Vita geht es nämlich keineswegs in erster Linie um Fragen des Gebets oder der Schriftbetrachtung, sondern um Wert und Stellenwert gesteigerter Askese. Der fragliche Text lautet wörtlich:

> Während der vierzig Tage (der österlichen Fastenzeit) kam er (Theodoros) zu unserem Vater Pachom und fragte ihn: "Da das Passa sechs Tage zählt, an denen unsere Vergebung und Rettung bewirkt wurde, sollten wir nicht zusätzlich zu den zwei Tagen auch noch die (ersten) vier fasten?" (d.h. die ganze "Karwoche") Er antwortete ihm: "Die Regel der Kirche ist, daß wir nur diese zwei Tage (zum Fasten) verbinden sollen, damit wir die Kraft haben, ohne schwach zu werden zu erfüllen, was uns geboten ist, nämlich unaufhörliches Gebet, Nachtwachen, 'meditieren' von Gottes Gebot und unsre Handarbeit, die uns in der Heiligen Schrift aufgetragen ist und die es uns erlaubt, unsere Hände den Armen zu öffnen. Diejenigen, die solche Dinge tun (nämlich viel fasten), und auch die, die sich in die Einsamkeit zurückziehen, sind (zwar) frei von menschlichen Bürden, die sie belasten könnten, aber oft sehen wir, daß andere, die schlechter sind als sie selbst, ihnen dienen, und daß sie stolz oder entmutigt sind oder vergeblich nach menschlicher und eitler Ehre haschen."[15]

In der Tat war es zur damaligen Zeit üblich, nur am Freitag und Samstag der heiligen Woche zu fasten. Die Frage des Theodoros zielt auf

eine strengere Askese, offensichtlich getrieben von dem Bedürfnis, dem Gedenken an das Leiden Jesu einen angemessenen Ausdruck zu verleihen. Die Motive seiner Frömmigkeit waren sicherlich von echter Liebe und Hingabe an den Herrn getragen. Er wollte durch strengeres Fasten seinen Leib und sein Leben Gott als lebendiges Opfer darbringen. (vgl. Röm 12, 1-2) Diese Gestalt der Nachfolge Christi hatte im Anachoretentum bleibenden Ausdruck gefunden und verband sich dort mit dem Gedanken des unblutigen Martyriums. Das Ausharren in den Unannehmlichkeiten der Askese bis zum Lebensende wurde als Teilnahme am Leiden Christi verstanden, der um unseretwillen arm wurde und allem entsagte. (vgl. 2 Kor. 8,9; Phil. 2,6-8)[16]

Pachom waren solche Motive sicher nicht fremd, war er doch selbst einige Jahre lang in der Schule eines Anachoreten gewesen.[17] Dennoch erteilt er Theodoros eine Absage. Denn dessen Frage zielt nicht auf eine persönliche Frömmigkeitsübung, wie sie den Pachomianern freistanden, sondern er wollte das strengere Fasten für *alle* Brüder vorschlagen.

In der Antwort des großen Koinobiarchen geht es daher um das, was für die Gemeinschaft der Brüder das Wesentliche ist, abgesehen von persönlichen asketischen Leistungen, wie sie den einzelnen anheimgestellt waren. Es geht um nichts weniger als die Berufung der Koinonia.

Bezeichnend ist einmal, daß Pachom an erster Stelle den Brauch der Kirche nennt. Darüber will und muß er nicht hinausgehen, um echtes geistliches Leben in seiner Gemeinschaft zu gestalten. Die darauf folgende Nennung von Gebet, Nachtwachen und Meditation der Schrift gehört in der Tat zu den üblichen Fixpunkten monastischer Spiritualität, wie auch die Warnung vor einer Schwächung der körperlichen und seelischen Kraft durch überzogene Askese in den Apophthegmen der Wüstenväter immer wieder zu finden ist.[18] Auffallend ist dann aber die Hervorhebung der Handarbeit durch die beigefügte doppelte Begründung: sie ist nämlich erstens in der Schrift geboten, und sie ermöglicht zweitens, die "Hände den Armen zu öffnen," d.h. Almosen zu geben, Arme zu unterstützen, abzugeben und zu teilen, was man erarbeitet hat. In dieser zweifachen Begründung scheint mir die Klimax der Argumentation zu liegen. Gerade sie wurde in dem verkürzten Zitat der Stelle weggelassen!

Der Nachsatz, in dem ein für Pachom typisches Mißtrauen gegenüber dem eremitischen Leben zum Ausdruck kommt, ist als Warnung an Theodoros zu verstehen, nicht einem falschen Ideal nachzueifern und unversehens in die Falle des Hochmuts und der Ehrsucht zu geraten.

Das "opus monasticum" der Pachomianer

Es geht Pachom also in der Tat um das *opus monasticum* seiner Koinonia, aber unter dem Gesichtspunkt, was Berufung und Auftrag der Gemeinschaft ist. Es geht, zumindest für ihn selbst, um nichts weniger als um das Ganze seines Lebenswerks, um Kern und Stern des Koinobitentums pachomianischer Prägung. In diesen Kontext soll das genannte Wort abschließend gestellt werden.

Bekanntlich wurde die Bekehrung Pachoms durch die Liebestat der ihm persönlich völlig unbekannten Christen von Theben (Nê) ausgelöst. Damals gelobte er, alle Tage den Menschen dienen zu wollen um Jesu willen. Dieses Gelöbnis hat ihn zwangsläufig dazu geführt, Menschen um sich zu sammeln und für Menschen da zu sein, sowohl für seine Brüder als auch mit diesen zusammen für die Menschen seiner Umgebung.[19]

Den Menschen zu dienen um der Liebe Christi willen, das ist die Grundmelodie in Pachoms Leben, die immer wieder in den verschiedensten Variationen erklingt. So heißt es z.B. über die ersten Brüder, die Pachom um sich sammelte, "daß sie noch nicht geneigt waren, sich zu der vollkommenen Gemeinschaft zu verbinden, zu der Art, wie in der Apostelgeschichte über die Glaubenden geschrieben ist: 'Sie waren ein Herz und eine Seele, und alle Güter gehörten ihnen gemeinsam; es gab keinen, der von dem, was ihm gehörte, gesagt hätte: das ist mein!' (Apg. 4,32) Wie es auch der Apostel sagt: 'Vergeßt nicht das Wohltun und die Gemeinschaft, denn das sind die Opfer, die Gott wohlgefallen.' (Hebr. 13,16)"[20] Die Koinonia der Urgemeinde, das Teilen der Güter und die darin praktizierte Bruderliebe: das ist das Paradigma, dem Pachom folgt.[21]

Er selbst bot das deutlichste Beispiel dafür: Er kochte für seine Brüder, putzte, empfing Besucher und teilte die Arbeit ein.[22] Als "Diener aller" verstand er sich, darin sah er seine Berufung und innere Verpflichtung, und er fürchtet die Strafe des Gerichtes Gottes, sollte er diesem Auftrag nicht nachkommen.[23]

Besonders sprechend ist das Bibelzitat aus dem Hebräerbrief, das dem oben erwähnten Bericht über die ersten Brüder neben dem Wort der Apostelgeschichte als weitere Begründung aus der Heiligen Schrift beigegeben ist: "Vergeßt nicht das Wohltun und die Gemeinschaft, denn das sind die Opfer, die Gott wohlgefallen." (Hebr. 13,16)[24] Man kann dieses Wort auf die Fragestellung beziehen, die hier zur Debatte steht. Es geht ja Theodoros um das Fasten der Gemeinschaft, also um eine Form von Opfer. Die Anachoreten brachten viele Opfer dieser Art an Schlaf, Essen, Trinken

oder Körperkraft. Für Pachom galt gemäß dem Hebräerbrief eine andere Art von Opfer: die Gemeinschaft (und diese fordert einem durchaus auch Opfer ab) und das Wohltun, d.h. das Teilen, das Mitteilen der eigenen Gaben und Güter, die Hilfsbereitschaft, oder, um es mit der Formulierung des hier in Frage stehenden Wortes Pachoms zu sagen: das Öffnen der Hände für die Armen.

In einer Katechese spricht Pachom es deutlich aus: "Ich will euch über die Brüder belehren, die in der Koinonia die niedrigsten sind, die sich nicht großen Übungen hingeben und keine maßlose Askese (!) praktizieren, aber schlicht in der Reinheit des Leibes leben nach den eingesetzten Regeln und im Gehorsam und in der Verpflichtung. In der Sicht der Anachoreten sieht ihr Leben nicht vollkommen aus, und man blickt auf sie als auf die Niedrigsten . . . (Aber) sie werden vollkommen erfunden werden im Gesetz Christi (vgl. Gal. 6,2!)[25] wegen ihrer Treue. . . . Sie sind auch den Anachoreten weit überlegen, denn sie wandeln in der Verbindlichkeit, in der der Apostel wandelte, wie geschrieben ist: In der Liebe des Geistes dienet einander in einem freundlichen Geist und in aller Geduld vor unserem Herrn." (Bo 105) Auch hier werden wieder Askese und Bruderliebe einander gegenüber gestellt. Die "Verbindlichkeit der Apostel," also die *vita apostolica*[26] im pachomianischen Sinne, besteht in der dienenden Liebe, in Freundlichkeit und Geduld, und das sind Tugenden der sozialen Beziehungen unter den Brüdern. Diese Akzentsetzung, auch in ihrem fast schroffen Gegensatz zur Askese der Anachoreten, ist typisch für Pachom und sein Verständnis der Koinonia. Hierin liegt sein tiefstes Anliegen und sein ureigenster Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Mönchtums.

Ein Beispiel soll diese Pointe illustrieren. Als Pachom von einer längeren Visitationsreise zurückkehrte, erfuhr er, daß es im "Dorf"[27] seit zwei Monaten keine gekochten Speisen mehr gegeben hatte. Der Koch hatte die warmen Mahlzeiten eingestellt, weil viele der Brüder freiwillig darauf verzichtet hatten. Stattdessen hatte er gebetet und dabei 500 Matten geflochten, eine beachtliche Leistung, für die Pachom allerdings keinerlei Respekt aufbrachte: er verbrannte die Matten vor den Augen der Brüder. Dazu erklärte er, daß auf der einen Seite der freiwillige Verzicht auf gekochte Speisen seiner Freiwilligkeit beraubt wird, wenn es von vornherein nur Rohkost gibt, daß aber auf der anderen Seite ein kranker Mitbruder, der erwarten darf, am Tisch der Brüder etwas Gemüse zu finden, enttäuscht wird und Anstoß nimmt, weil er nicht erhält, was er braucht, obwohl es nach der Regel gereicht werden müßte. Hier liegt der Höhepunkt der Argumentation Pachoms, und er fährt fort: "Oder weißt du nicht, daß besonders Knaben

noch nicht in der Tugend durchhalten können, wenn man ihnen nicht eine Entspannung oder einen kleinen Trost gewährt?"[28]

Handarbeit, begleitet von Gebet, das gehörte zu den Tugenden des Mönchtums, wie wir nun genugsam gesehen haben. Insofern hatte sich der "Küchenbruder" tadellos verhalten. Aber es kam Pachom auf etwas anderes an, so wenig er sonst diese Art der Beschäftigung verachtete, wurde sie doch selbst bei den gemeinsamen Gebetszeiten praktiziert. Hier war nämlich die Bruderliebe verletzt. Die (milde) Regel, daß es bei Tisch gekochtes Gemüse zu geben habe, war von Pachom um der Kranken und Schwachen willen erlassen worden, wie seine Zurechtweisung des Koches beweist. Ihnen Anstoß zu bereiten und auf ihre Bedürftigkeit keine Rücksicht zu nehmen, das verletzte die Liebe und damit das Grundgesetz der pachomianischen Koinonia. In dieser Liebe aber gipfelte das *opus monasticum* der Pachomianer.

Betrachten wir rückblickend noch einmal das genannte Zitat, dann tritt uns das spezifisch pachomianische *opus monasticum* deutlich vor Augen. Auf die Frage nach einem strengeren Fasten für die Allgemeinheit der Brüder erklärt Pachom, daß die damit verbundene Schwächung des Leibes nicht nur Gebet, Nachtwachen und Schriftbetrachtung beinträchtigt, sondern vor allem auch die Handarbeit, durch die ein ganz wesentlicher und unabdingbarer Teil der Berufung von Pachoms Koinonia ermöglicht wird: die tätige Nächstenliebe gemäß dem ursprünglichen Gelübde Pachoms. Diese Liebe ist der Bezugspunkt aller anderen Aspekte des brüderlichen Lebens. Auf sie hin ist alles relativiert, auch die Askese. Das ist "der" wichtigste Aspekt des koinobitischen Lebens im Sinne Pachoms, der den anderen vier Grundpfeilern monastischer Spiritualität den alles verändernden Bezugsrahmen setzt. Koinobitisches Leben im wahren Sinne des Wortes ist ohne diesen Bezug nach Pachom nicht denkbar.

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] Zur Begründung dieser Datierung s. Ch. Joest, Ein Versuch zur Chronologie Pachoms und Theodoros', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 85 (1994) 132-144.

[2] H. Holze, *Erfahrung und Theologie im frühen Mönchtum*. Untersuchungen zu einer Theologie des monastischen Lebens bei den ägyptischen Mönchsvätern, Johannes Cassian und Benedikt von Nursia. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1994.

[3] H. Holze, Könobitische Gebetspraxis und individuelle Gebetserfahrung in den pachomianischen Klöstern. In: *Wort und Dienst* (Jahrbuch der Kirchlichen Hochschule Bethel) 21 (1991) 133-147; ders., Schrifterfahrung und Christuserkenntnis im pachomianischen Mönchtum, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 49 (1993) 54-65.

[4] H. Holze, Könobitische Gebetspraxis (s. Anm. 3) 142; ders., Schrifterfahrung (s. Anm. 3) 57 f.

[5] H. Holze, Könobitische Gebetspraxis (s. Anm. 3) 142.

[6] Vgl. *Praecepta* 4.5.7.12 (lat./dt. bei H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs*. Studien zum frühen Mönchtum II. Pachomius—der Mann und sein Werk. Würzburg: Echter 1983, 82 f. 84).

[7] S. Anm. 3.

[8] H. Bacht, "Meditatio" in den ältesten Mönchsquellen. In: ders., *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs*. Studien zum frühen Mönchtum I. Würzburg: Echter ²1984, 244-264; F. Ruppert, Meditatio—Ruminatio. Zu einem Grundbegriff christlicher Meditation, *Erbe und Auftrag* 53 (1977) 83-93.

[9] H. Holze, Schrifterfahrung (s. Anm. 3) 57 f.

[10] Vgl. z.B. die Apophthegmen Synkletika 16 u. 17, dt. bei B. Miller, *Weisung der Väter*. Apophthegmata Patrum, auch Gerontikon oder Alphabeticum genannt (Sophia 6). Trier: Paulinus ³1989, Nr. 907 f.; zum Ganzen vgl. Ch. Joest, Proverbia 6,3 und die Bruderliebe bei den Pachomianern, *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993) 119-130, hier: 119-121; zur Gehorsamsfrage bei den Pachomianern insgesamt: Ch. Joest, Pachom und Theodoros. Konflikte im Autoritätsverständnis bei den Pachomianern, *Theologie und Philosophie* 68 (1993) 517-530; F. Ruppert, *Das pachomianische Mönchtum und die Anfänge des klösterlichen Gehorsams* (MüSt 20). Münsterschwarzach: Vier Türme 1971.

[11] Vgl. H. Bacht, Das Armutsverständnis des Pachomius und seiner Jünger. In: ders., *Das Vermächtnis I* (s. Anm. 8) 225-243; Ch. Joest, Vom Sinn der Armut bei den Mönchsvätern Ägyptens. Über den Einfluß des kulturellen Hintergrunds auf das Konzept der Askese, *Geist und Leben* 66 (1993) 249-271; B. Steidle, Die Armut in der frühen Kirche und im alten Mönchtum, *Erbe und Auftrag* 41 (1965) 460-481.

[12] S. dazu H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis II* (s. Anm. 6), das ganz dem Thema und dem Text der Pachomianer-Regeln gewidmet ist.

[13] Vgl. hier noch einmal meine Anm. 10 u. 11 genannten Aufsätze: Proverbia 6,3; Pachom und Theodoros; Vom Sinn der Armut; ferner auch Ch. Joest, ". . . alle Tage den Menschen dienen." Pachomius und seine ursprüngliche Inspiration zum koinobitischen Leben, *Erbe und Auftrag* 67 (1991) 35-50; ders., Apa Pachom—Mönchsvater und Diener aller. Die Doppelberufung Pachoms und sein Konflikt mit Theodoros, *Studia Monastica* 36 (1994) 165-181; ders., Benedikt von Nursia und der Stellenwert gegenseitiger brüderlicher Liebe bei Pachom, Horsiesi und Basileios d. Großen, *Erbe und Auftrag* 68 (1992) 312-326.

[14] Vgl. H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis I* (s. Anm. 8) 252.

[15] Bo 35: L. Th. Lefort, *Sancti Pachomii vita bohairice scripta* (CSCO 107). Löwen: Durbecq 1936, 26,5-13 = frz. ders., *Les Vies coptes de Saint Pachôme et de ses premieurs successeurs* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 16). Löwen: Muséon 1943, 105,31-106,8; engl. A. Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia I*. The Life of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples (CS 45). Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publ. ²1985, 59 f. Im folgenden werden die Abschnitte der Vita nur mit dem Sigel "Bo" zitiert; sie sind in den angeführten Ausgaben unter der laufenden Nummer leicht zu finden.

[16] Vgl. K.S. Frank, *Grundzüge der Geschichte des christlichen Mönchtums*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges. ³1979, 14 f.; L. Holtz, *Geschichte des christlichen Ordenslebens*, Zürich: Benziger ²1991, 14; W. Kern, Zur Theologie des Ordensstandes, *Geist und Leben* 32 (1959) 57-60, hier: 59; U. Ranke-Heinemann, *Das frühe Mönchtum*. Seine Motive nach den Selbstzeugnissen. Essen: Driewer 1964, 95-100; B. Steidle, Homo Dei Antonius. Zum Bild des "Mannes Gottes" im alten Mönchtum. In: ders., *Antonius magnus eremita, 356-1956*.

Studia ad antiquum monachismum spectantia (StAns 38). Rom: Herder 1956, 148-200, hier: 153 u. 170-172; ders., Per oboedientiam laborem ... per inoboedientiam desidiam. Zu Prolog 2 der Regel St. Benedikts, *Erbe und Auftrag* 53 (1977) 428-435, hier: 434 f.; *Erbe und Auftrag* 54 (1978) 200-216.280-285, hier: 201.205-209. 211 f.

[17] Vgl. Ch. Joest, Apa Pachom (s. Anm. 13) 167 f.

[18] Vgl. z.B. Antonios 8, Agathon 20, Megethios 2 u. ö., Miller, *Weisung der Väter* (s. Anm. 10) Nr. 8, 102, 536.

[19] Ch. Joest, "... alle Tage den Menschen dienen" (s. Anm. 13).

[20] S^1: Lefort, *Vies coptes* (s. Anm. 15) 3,27-32; engl. bei Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia I* (s. Anm. 15) 431.

[21] Man muß sogar von einem regelrechten Paradigmenwechsel sprechen. Fühlten sich die Anachoreten durch das Wort Jesu an den reichen Jüngling verpflichtet: "Willst du vollkommen sein, verkaufe, was du hast und gib es den Armen und folge mir nach" (Mt. 19,21), vgl. die Antonios-Vita Kap. 2, so war es für Pachom die Gemeinschaft der ersten Christen in Jerusalem; s. Ch. Joest, Apa Pachom (s. Anm. 13); ders., *Spiritualität evangelischer Kommunitäten.* Altkirchlich-monastische Tradition in evangelischen Kommunitäten von heute. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1995, 101-104.

[22] S^1: Lefort, *Vies coptes* (s. Anm. 15) 3,12-21.33-4,9; engl. bei Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia I* (s. Anm. 15) 430-432.

[23] Vgl. Bo 61.

[24] Dieser Schriftvers wurde offenbar unter den Pachomianern häufiger angeführt, um ihr Spezifikum zu charakterisieren, denn auch Horsiesi, der zweite Nachfolger Pachoms im Amt der Gesamtleitung der Koinonia, zitiert ihn, s. LibOrs 50: A. Boon, *Pachomiana latina.* Règle et Épitres de S. Pachôme etc., Texte latine de S. Jerôme. Löwen: Bureaux de la Revue 1932, 142,14 ff.; dt. bei Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis I* (s. Anm. 8) 187.

[25] Das "Gesetz Christi" nach Gal. 6,2, daß "einer des anderen Last" tragen soll, wird auch in Pachoms Brief 5 erwähnt: Boon (s. Anm. 24) 92,12-14.

[26] Vgl. K.S. Frank, Vita Apostolica. Ansätze zur apostolischen Lebensform in der alten Kirche, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 82 (1971) 145-166; man beachte aber den Gegensatz zwischen dem von Frank dargestellten altkirchlichen Bild der *vita apostolica* ("Der Apostel als Asket" 154 ff.) und der hier zu beschreibenden Auffassung Pachoms!

[27] In Bezug auf die pachomianischen Siedlungen spricht man zutreffender von "Dörfern" anstatt von "Klöstern," wie sie es auch selbst gelegentlich taten, s. Ch. Joest, Apa Pachom (s. Anm. 13) 171 f.; ders., *Spiritualität evangelischer Kommunitäten* (s. Anm. 21) 120-122.

[28] Paral 8,15-16, in: F. Halkin, *Sancti Pachomii vitae graecae* (SH 19). Brüssel: Société des Bollandistes 1932, 138,12-140,8; engl. bei: A. Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia II.* Pachomian Chronicles and Rules (CS 46). Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publ. 1981, 36-38 (in der Abschnittszählung folge ich Veilleux).

D-65597 *Hünfelden*, Gradenthal 14

NICAEA AND THE WEST

BY

JÖRG ULRICH

Alleged Western influences on the historical and theological proceedings of the first "oecumenical" council in Nicaea A.D. 325 have long been a matter for scholarly discussion. Since Theodor Zahn's book on Marcellus of Ancyra[1] the idea of Western influence or even the Western origin of the Nicene creed has continuously found much support among learned commentators. It has been adopted in different versions by such eminent scholars as Adolf von Harnack,[2] Jaako Gummerus,[3] Friedrich Loofs,[4] Gustav Krüger[5] and others, who all tried to establish a relation between the strong emphasis on the divine unity in the early Western theologians like Tertullian on the one hand and in the Nicene creed on the other.[6]

It is fair to say that this theory of Western influence has long been widely accepted as *the* authority in explaining the history and the theology of Nicaea. Nevertheless, in the last fifteen years, it has been seriously questioned and has suffered some severe criticism, especially by the works of Christopher Stead,[7] although it has still also found some prominent supporters, such as Wolfgang Bienert, in his detailed discussion of the subject.[8] In 1988 the late bishop and scholar R.P.C. Hanson gave a full report on the current state of research in his foundational book "*The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*,"[9] unfortunately without taking Bienert's arguments into account.

The following brief study will try to prove that as with the Arian Controversy from A.D. 318 onwards, the proceedings of the council of Nicaea took place without any considerable involvement of Western theology, and that Western isolation continued after the decisions of 325. According to everything we can piece together from the unfortunately few sources that exist, the West remained strangely untouched by the dogmatic discussions on the Trinity at Nicaea until the forties of the fourth century. It was well into the sixties before Western theologians came to consider the more theoretical and dogmatically elaborate questions that Arius and his friends had raised and that the council of Nicaea had answered some forty or fifty years previously.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 10-24

I. *The West before Nicaea*

Western theology of the Trinity before Nicaea was formed almost wholly by Tertullian.[10] In his "*Adversus Praxean*"[11] he argues against modalistic ideas in favour of a unity of the Trinity in three persons (Father, Son and Spirit), "three, however, not in condition [*statu*], but in degree [*gradu*], three not in substance [*substantia*], but in form [*forma*], three not in power [*potestate*], but in aspect [*specie*], yet of one substance [*unius substantiae*]."[12] He emphasizes the unity in the Trinity, but he also indicates subordinating aspects (of order, not of nature) when he tries to distinguish the persons of the Trinity from each other. His tract was written to refute his modalistic opponents, but it was certainly not a masterpiece of speculative theology. Speculative theology was to be developed in the Greek philosophical and theological schools such as Origen's, whereas the West was never really very much interested in it. The Latins accused the Greeks of "using too many words."[13] Their theological tradition, in questions on the Trinity, was not prepared to react adequately to the complicated questions that the Arian controversy raised, after it had emerged from its origenistic roots.

Whereas Tertullian's impact on the Western theology of the Trinity can hardly be overestimated (Novatian in his "*De Trinitate*" spoke, like Tertullian, of a "*distinctio personarum*"),[14] there were other early Western contributions to the trinitarian question that were far less influential. The controversy between Hippolytus and Callistus in Rome dealt with the problem of the Trinity, when Callistus was accused of "Sabellianism," because he said that Father and Son were "one and the same."[15] Wolfgang Bienert thinks that the later Nicene term "*homoousios*" might have played a role in this controversy from the first half of the third century, but Hippolytus' account of the story gives no proof for this hypothesis.[16] Moreover, it seems very unlikely that Callistus, who emphasized the unity in the Trinity so much, should have used "*homoousios*," since the rare pre-Nicene use of this word appears to have expressed the common origin of *two* subjects.[17]

The only example of the pre-Nicene use of the term "*homoousios*" in the West is the so-called "controversy of the Dionysii," Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome, in the middle of the third century. The bishop of Alexandria uses the word indirectly, refering to it, but not adopting it himself.[18] Bienert thinks that Dionysius of Rome had demanded that his colleague accepted the word, because it was part of a valid decision on doctrine, but the difficulty is that Dionysius of Rome never uses it himself. This is even more astonishing, when we consider that Athanasius

quotes this text in his "*De decretis synodis*,"[19] written in about 358, with the intention of justifying the term "*homoousios*" in the Nicene creed. The fact that Athanasius does not quote the "*homoousios*" in Dionysius' text indicates clearly that Dionysius himself had not used it. The "controversy of the Dionysii" can therefore neither be understood as a precursor for the later Arian controversy nor can it be taken as a convincing proof for pre-nicene use of "*homoousios*." Luise Abramowski has given a number of good reasons in support of the theory that these texts do not belong at all to the "controversy of the Dionysii" in the third century, but to the time directly before the synod of Serdica in 342,[20] seventeen years after Nicaea.

The early Arian controversy itself shows no traces of Western involvement. It started about A.D. 318 in Alexandria between Arius and his bishop Alexander, who both came theologically from the same origenistic roots. The whole beginning of the Arian controversy can only be understood as a discussion within the theological heritage of Origen, who had raised the issue of the Son's relation to the Father in terms of nature. But Origen had not at all been read or talked about in the West until the end of the fourth century, when Rufinus of Aquileia translated his texts into Latin.

Once it had started in Alexandria in A.D. 318, the Arian controversy spread surprisingly quickly over the whole Greek speaking part of the Roman empire.[21] Alexander wrote a circular letter that covered mainly Palestine and Syriac, a synod in Bithynia declared itself in favour of Arius, and many bishops in Egypt also joined his side.[22] However, nowhere do we learn that Western theologians were involved in these proceedings.

All these points make it clear that Western events cannot be taken into account in sketching the theological background to the Arian controversy.

II. *The West at Nicaea*

The precise number of participants in the council of Nicaea is unknown. Minutes of the proceedings were obviously not taken.[23] Athanasius gives the number of bishops participating as 318, but this is probably an assumed number derived from the number of Abraham's servants, as stated in Genesis 14,14.[24] The lists of bishops at Nicaea contain 221 participants,[25] but they are incomplete. The real number may be somewhere between 250 and 300, but it is not certain that all of them took part over the whole duration of the council from the beginning to the end of June A.D. 325.[26]

Among the participants of the council that we know by name there are only six bishops from the Western part of the empire; these are Ossius of Cordoba,[27] Vicentius and Victor as representatives of the bishop of Rome, Silvester,[28] Markus from Calabria,[29] Caecilian of Carthage,[30] Domnus from Pannonia[31] and Nikasius from Gaul.[35] Wolfgang Bienert thinks that there were at least 100 bishops from the West present, because some Latin and Syriac versions of the bishop lists say that the names of the Western participants were omitted on purpose.[33] In addition, one can refer to Constantine's famous letter about the transfer of the synod from Ancyra to Nicaea, where the emperor gives the shorter journey for the *Western* participants as one of the reasons for his decision.[34] On the other hand, the function of the note in the Latin and Syriac bishop lists on the omission of the names of the Western bishops is clearly to explain the difference between the actual number of participants listed and the legendary number of 318. It can therefore hardly be taken as a serious source in support of the theory of a broad Western participation in the council. Furthermore, Constantine's letter fails to say, *how many* Western travellers were involved. In addition, the other reasons he gives for the transfer of the council are hardly substantial, for instance, he also mentions the better climatic conditions in Nicaea compared to Ancyra. The real reason for the transfer of the council was probably that Nicaea was located in the immediate vicinity of the emperor's residence in Nicomedia,[35] and that he would find it much easier to keep the proceedings of the council under his personal control if it were to take place in Nicaea instead of Ancyra.

According to our sources, we have no reason to believe that the real number of Western participants in the council was much larger than the six bishops we actually know about. Western participation in the first "oecumenical" council can therefore only have amounted to less than 5% or at the maximum 10%.

It can of course be asked if the actual *theological* influence of the small Western group in Nicaea was possibly greater than their numerical presence would indicate. In order to determine this, we would have to seek traces of Western theological tradition in the creed of the council.

The term "*homoousios*" in the Nicene creed has often been regarded as just such a translated Latin expression, namely as the Greek equivalent of the Latin "*una substantia.*" If this were correct, it would be very convincing proof of the Western theological influence on Nicaea. However, the hypothesis that "*homoousios*" is the equivalent of "*una substantia*" has to be

discounted. Christopher Stead[36] has convincingly shown that the correct translation of the Latin "*una substantia*" into Greek should be "*mia hypostasis*," not "*homoousios*," as found in the proceedings of the Western council of Serdica in 342. Furthermore, the Latin translation of "*homoousios*" is "*consubstantialis*," not "*una substantia*," as can be seen in the texts of Tertullian.[37] The earliest Latin versions of the Nicene creed do not translate the term "*homoousios*" into "*una substantia*," but put the Greek word in Latin transliteration.[38] Moreover, the Roman rhetor Marius Victorinus, one of the greatest experts on Greek-Latin translations in the whole fourth century,[39] discusses in his book "*Adversus Arium*" different possibilities of translating "*homoousios*" *into Latin*,[40] which would be entirely inexplicable if the word was itself a translation from earlier Latin tradition into Greek. All this evidence shows very clearly, that the hypothesis that the term "*homoousios*" used at Nicaea was of Latin origin is definitely to be discounted.[41] Alternatively, Wolfgang Bienert tries to show that the word comes *not* from Latin, but from Western Greek tradition, i.e. from Rome, where Greek was spoken until the first half of the third century. This, however, does not seem very likely, since there is no proof at all of the use of "*homoousios*" by the early Western Greek speaking authors (e.g. Hippolytus of Rome) and it has to be taken into account that these Greek speaking Western authors had very little influence on later theological tradition in the West, particularly *because* they had written in Greek.

If the "*homoousios*" cannot be taken as an indication of Western theological ideas in Nicaea, are there any other traces of influence by Western participants? What do we actually know about their ideas? And how did they succeed in introducing them into the debates? Obviously, they played only a small part in the theological proceedings of the council.[42] Vicentius and Victor, though representing the bishop of Rome, were only presbyters and were therefore not in a position to have much influence in a bishops' council.[43] Markus, Domnus and Nikasius are not mentioned anywhere else in our sources before or after Nicaea. Caecilian of Carthago died fairly soon after the council, and we have no information at all about his theological ideas and positions. So the only person from the West who could possibly have had a considerable influence on the theology of Nicaea is the bishop of Cordoba, Ossius.[44] He was the theological adviser and the "court bishop" of the emperor, and as such he had the chairmanship in the council and a hand in its proceedings and agenda.

The question is: how much did Ossius take part in the theological discussions on the Trinity in Nicaea and what was his own position on the matter likely to have been? Athanasius clearly says that Ossius formulated the Nicene creed,[45] but other sources do not seem to confirm this: Basil of Caesarea says that Hermogenes of Caesarea in Cappadocia drew up the creed,[46] and Eusebius tells us that the emperor himself was the person who inserted the "*homoousios*" into it.[47] As Christopher Stead has shown,[48] it is, according to Eusebius' accounts, impossible to assume that Ossius was responsible for the Nicene text, since Eusebius speaks obviously derogatively about those who produced it,[49] whereas he speaks very positively about Ossius, whom he calls a "peacemaker" in Nicaea.[50] The fact that Constantine was indeed very much in favour of the "*homoousios*" being incorporated in the creed does not justify the conclusion that Ossius, the emperor's court bishop, was responsible for it. It is well known, and Timothy Barnes has recently emphasized it strongly,[51] that Constantine himself was very much interested in theological and philosophical questions. Eusebius gives a brief account of Constantine's ideas on the "*homoousios*" in Nicaea, but unfortunately the emperor only says what the word should *not* mean, he gives no positive definition. Nevertheless, this short passage makes it appear most likely that the emperor himself, not Ossius, was *theologically* responsible for the inclusion of the term "*homoousios*" in the creed, as Eusebius' account on the council of Nicaea puts it: "And such were the theological remarks of our most wise and most religious emperor"[52]... Even if we do not rate the theological abilities of Constantine as highly as Barnes does, it still seems most unlikely that Constantine would rely mainly on a Westerner like Ossius when he had to solve a theological problem that merely concerned the bishops of the East.

The other reason why it seems dubious to emphasize Ossius' influence on the Nicene creed is the fact that there is hardly anything we know about his theological position. When the emperor Constantine sent him to Alexandria in A.D. 324 in order to find a peaceful solution between Arius and Alexander, he was obviously not very well informed about how the controversy had developed in the previous seven years. Furthermore, when he presided over the council of Antioch in early 325, he was found to be quite surprised by the theological ideas of Narcissus of Neronias, who freely admitted that he believed in three "*ousiai.*"[53] R.P.C. Hanson has shown that "the obvious bewilderment at the statements about the number of '*ousiai*' (...) does not at all suggest one who was versed in Greek philosophy

(even in translation) nor somebody who had recently devoted time to making a thorough study of '*hypostasis*' and '*ousia.*'"[54] It is not very likely that Ossius had a particularly clear view on what was going on theologically in the complicated Greek discussions, and his task was more to bring the different parties and groups to a peaceful agreement than to find a theological solution of the problem of the Trinity.

This view on Ossius' position in Nicaea is quite in keeping with what we know about his later career. Theologically, he had put his name to several rather differing creeds: The creed of Antioch in early 325, the Nicene creed, the so-called "Western" creed of Serdica in 342 that was almost Sabellian, and the homoean creed of Sirmium in 357[55] that was almost Arian.[56] There is no reason to believe that he had a firm or a rigid position on the theological problems in question. Politically, he was always the person who tried persistently to find peaceful solutions and to bring the hostile parties back to the conference table: In Antioch, 324, he passes on Constantine's letter to Arius and Alexander, urging them to cease their controversy. In Nicaea, Eusebius calls him the "peacemaker." In Serdica, 342, he tries hard, but in the end in vain, to avoid the split between East and West.[57] And in Sirmium, 357, he signs a creed that strictly prohibited any use of the terms "*substantia,*" "*homoousios*" and "*homoiousios,*"[58] hoping that this decision might put an end to the controversy that by that time had been going on for about forty years.

The fact that the Spaniard Ossius presided over the Council, does not justify any *theological* conclusions. The hypothesis of a significant influence by Western theologians on the council of Nicaea 325 has to be discounted.

III. *The West after Nicaea*

After Nicaea, the West remained "blessedly aloof from the bitter Arian Controversy. Even the decisions of the Council of Nicaea, despite their tremendous importance for the future of Christianity, barely caused a stir in the West."[59] Ossius of Cordoba, for reasons we do not know,[60] left the imperial court and went back to Spain. The controversy about the rehabilitation of Arius and the theological debate between Eustathius of Antioch and Marcellus of Ancyra left no traces in the West.

The first time that Western theologians came in touch with the problems that had arisen from the Arian controversy was at the council of Rome A.D. 340. Marcellus and Athanasius had been deposed from their sees in Ancyra and Alexandria, Marcellus for dogmatic reasons and Athanasius

on grounds of conduct.[61] Both had gone into exile in the West, and they tried there to gain support for their positions. This was all the easier, since the empire, after the death of Constantine in 337, had been divided into three, and from 340 onwards into two parts, so that it was possible to gain support from one emperor (Constans in the West) against the other (Constantius in the East). Matters of politics, church politics and theology were inextricably entangled.

Marcellus succeeded in convincing the synod of Rome, in which about fifty bishops from Italy participated, that he was not guilty and therefore orthodox. It has often been said that Marcellus deceived the council and concealed his true, unorthodox views,[62] but this theory is unacceptable. The declaration of faith that Marcellus gave in Rome is the only original remaining text of his, and, for methodical reasons, any study of Marcellus' theology has to start off with this text.[63] Moreover, recent studies have shown that all the ideas in Marcellus' Roman text are quite in keeping with what we know about him from other sources,[64] for example from his opponent Eusebius.

Marcellus, in his Roman justification of his theological views,[65] first argued against "those who teach that the Son is a different *hypostasis*," which presumably referred directly to Asterius and his supporters,[66] but, in a more general way, aimed at all Eastern Origenists. He then quoted, as proof for his orthodoxy, not the Nicene creed but one resembling the Old Roman Creed, which by that time was the liturgical creed in Rome and is the ancestor of our present Apostles' Creed. Finally, Marcellus gave his own views on the issue of the Trinity and interpreted the relation between God the Father and God the Son as "one substance" ("*mia ousia/ hypostasis*"). This was in fact more than Nicaea had said. But Marcellus felt that Nicaea had not gone far enough in an anti-arian (and anti-origenistic) direction, and he succeeded in Rome in giving the impression that his "*mia hypostasis*"-terminology was identical with what the fathers of Nicaea had aimed at.

The bishop of Rome, Julius, after asking his presbyters Vicentius and Victor, the participants from Nicaea, found that Marcellus' views were quite in accordance with the doctrine of the church, and the Roman synod of 50 bishops agreed.[67] This means that the first official Western statement in the trinitarian controversy was an adoption of the ideas of Marcellus of Ancyra as the correct and orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. The Roman synod did not demand a subscription to the creed of Nicaea itself, which was obviously not very well known in the Western parts of the Roman

empire in 341, nor did anybody mention the "*homoousios.*" Instead, they accepted Marcellus' interpretation of the Trinity "*as being in accordance with the theology of Nicaea.*"[68] But what the Western theologians received in A.D. 341 was in actual fact not the genuine Nicene theology, but Marcellus' interpretation of it, which gave the Nicene declaration an emphasis on the unity of the Trinity that was even stronger than in the Nicene creed itself.[69]

Of course we must ask why Marcellus' ideas were so successful in Rome, and any answer to this question firstly should look to the theology of Tertullian that was still well-known in the West. Marcellus' views were in some respects not too far away from Tertullian, particularly because Tertullian had spoken of "*una substantia*" in his important work "*Adversus Praxean.*"[70] "*Una substantia*" was still acknowledged as orthodox in the West, and Marcellus' "*mia ousia/hypostasis*" was the precise equivalent to it.[71] This was a good reason for the synod of Rome to agree that Marcellus' ideas were in accordance with the doctrine of the church. Nevertheless, there were also important differences between Tertullian's and Marcellus' theologies, especially since Marcellus did not take up Tertullian's "*distinctio personarum*"[72] and avoided talking about different "*personae*" in God the Father and God the Son. Therefore, theological affinity between Marcellus and Tertullian cannot be accepted as the only explanation for Marcellus' success in the West. It secondly has to be said that Marcellus' polemic against the origenist doctrine of "three *hypostaseis*" as being Arian must have reminded the Westerners of the heretic doctrine of "three *substantiae*" that as early as the third century had been regarded as theologically gruesome in the West.[73] Thirdly, we also have to recall the general ecclesiastico-political situation in A.D. 340 which, under the circumstances of growing difficulties between East and West, made it easy for an Eastern refugee to gain political and also theological support in Rome.

Despite the decision in Rome, Marcellus and Athanasius were of course not yet entirely satisfied, since the sentences against them were still in force in the East. So they tried to procure a general council of both East and West, and aimed at making the decision of Rome binding for the whole empire. The council of Serdica in 342 was supposed to find an agreement between the Eastern and the Western part of the empire but, as is well known, it failed miserably. Leslie Barnard has written a thorough study of the proceedings of the Serdican council,[74] so that it is possible to restrict ourselves to the creed of the Western part of the synod. The Western half

of the council of Serdica consisted of about 95 bishops, 50-60% of them speaking the Greek language,[75] and they drew up a creed,[76] presumably first written in Greek and then translated into Latin. Theologically, this creed was entirely subjected to Marcellan influences. It emphasized the term "*mia hypostasis*"/Latin: "*una substantia*" and it strictly ruled out any ideas of two or three "*hypostaseis*"/Latin: "*substantiae*" as being Arian. Moreover, it held the difference between God the Father and God the Son to be insignificant, i.e. purely a matter of terminology. It stated that the Father differed only in name from the Son. This was in fact not far away from Sabellianism, the theological opposite extreme to Arianism. The Western creed of Serdica was an extremely rigid interpretation of Nicaea in one direction. We have Ossius' letter written from the council to the Roman bishop Julius, in which Ossius says that the Serdican creed was not intended to remove the Nicene one,[77] but it has to be recognized that in fact it was the Serdican creed, not the Nicene one that was widely spread in the Latin speaking West in the years after 342.[78] Moreover, the "Western" Serdican creed was theologically dependent not upon early Western trinitarian theology, but upon the Eastern exiles Marcellus and Athanasius.

After Serdica, different regional councils took place that agreed with the Serdican decisions, namely the council of Gaul in 346,[79] a synod in Carthage, perhaps in 347,[80] and synods in Sicily and Sardinia,[81] and in Spain, where Ossius bound his episcopal colleagues to the Serdican decisions.[82] At all these councils Western bishops concurred with the decisions and with the "Western," in actual fact Marcellan, creed of Serdica.

The first Western theologians in the fourth century who left small Latin tracts on the question of the Trinity, Phoebadius[83] and Gregory of Elvira,[84] took their ideas and views mainly from the creed of Serdica in 342 and not so much from that of Nicaea. Phoebadius, in his "*Contra Arrianos*," written in order to reject the anti-nicene second creed of Sirmium (357) said that the Council of Serdica had "*confirmed the decisions of Nicaea and rejected Arianism.*"[85] The theological differences between Nicaea and the Marcellan interpretation of Nicaea in Serdica were obviously not known to him. All arguments in his tract against the Arians are theologically influenced by the Serdican creed, not by the Nicene one.[86] Although we have every reason to believe that Phoebadius knew a Latin version of the Nicene creed,[87] he doesn't make any use of it. Instead, he insists on the Serdican term "*una substantia*," but astonishingly with explicit reference to the decisions of Nicaea,[88] although in actual fact "*una substantia*" (or Greek "*mia hypostasis*")

had played no role in Nicaea at all. On the other hand, nowhere does Phoebadius mention the Nicene "*homoousios*" or a Latin equivalent of it.

The summary of his "*Contra Arrianos*" reads as follows: "*ut fides catholica confitetur, unam substantiam et duas docuit esse personas.*"[89] This is the "*una substantia/(mia hypotasis)*"-theology of Serdica combined with Tertullian's "*distinctio personarum.*"[90] The brief tract clearly shows that in matters of the Trinity Phoebadius was still a disciple of Tertullian and that he, as far as the Arian controversy was concerned, regarded the theology he knew from the texts of Serdica as being identical with what the fathers in Nicaea had said.

Gregory of Elvira, in his first version of his "*De fide orthodoxa,*" is also influenced by the theology of Serdica and its strong emphasis on the unity in the Godhead.[91] It is most interesting that Gregory, after the orthodoxy of the first version of his tract "*De fide orthodoxa*" had been put into question (like the creed of Serdica-West, it was not far away from Sabellianism), then put a Latin translation of the creed of Nicaea at the head of the second version, in order to prove the orthodoxy of his revised text. This is, to our knowledge, the first instance that a theologian from the Latin-speaking West used the actual text of the Nicene creed as a proof for his orthodoxy in matters of the Trinity. Moreover, the little scene shows that by the time of the second edition of "*De fide orthodoxa*" the text of the Nicene creed itself must already to some extent have been known in the West, otherwise it would not have made any sense to use it as a preface for a revised tract on the Trinity. But the date of the second edition of Gregory's "*De fide orthodoxa*" is about A.D. 364, almost forty years after Nicaea! And yet, it was only the third mention of a Latin version of the Nicene creed in the sources that have remained, after Hilary of Poitiers in 357[92] and Lucifer of Calaris in 358.[93] How little the Nicene creed of 325 was known in the West until the end of the fifties is most clearly shown by a quotation of the comparatively very learned bishop Hilary in his "*Liber de Synodis.*" He frankly says that before he was about to be sent into exile (sc.: In A.D. 356!) he had never heard anything about the Nicene creed![94] According to all that we know, this statement can by no means be taken as an exception, but rather as a reflection of the general theological situation in the West. As is well known, Hilary, in his exile in the East from A.D. 356 onwards,[95] soon became better informed about the theological implications of the Arian controversy and then became the most important person to introduce the West to the theology of Nicaea—and to the Nicene creed itself.

It took almost forty years until Latin theologians such as Gregory of Elvira began to receive the text of the Nicene creed and to use it as the guiding principle of orthodoxy in matters of the Trinity. And it was well into the sixties of the fourth century, almost half a century after the first ecumenical council in A.D. 325, when Latin speaking theologians entered into the debates about the theology of Nicaea and then started to become more independent and more constructive partners in the search for the Christian doctrine of God, such as Marius Victorinus, Ambrose of Milan, and finally, of course, the founder of a distinctive Western theological tradition in questions of the Trinity after Nicaea, Augustine of Hippo.

NOTES

[1] Theodor Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie* (Gotha 1867) 10-18.

[2] A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte 2* (Darmstadt 1964 = [4]1909) 230-236.

[3] J. Gummerus, *Die homöusianische Partei bis zum Tode des Konstantius* (Leipzig 1900) 8-10.

[4] F. Loofs, Das Nicänum, *Festgabe für K. Müller* (Tübingen 1922) 68-82.

[5] G. Krüger, *Das Dogma von der Dreieinigkeit und Gottmenschheit* (Tübingen 1905) 194.

[6] On the attempts at establishing a connection between Latin "*una substantia*" (Tertullian) and Greek "*homousios*" (Nicaea) cf. p. 5.

[7] C. Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford 1977) 250-255; id., Art. Homousios, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 16 (1992) 400 f.

[8] W. Bienert, Das vornicaenische homousios als Ausdruck der Rechtgläubigkeit, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 90 (1979) 151-175.

[9] Edinburgh 1988, pp. 169-172. 198-202.

[10] A.M. Ritter, Dogma und Lehre in der Alten Kirche, *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte* 1 (Göttingen 1982) 142; R.P.C. Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 198. 517.

[11] Ed. E. Kroyman/E. Evans (CChr.SL 2) 1159-1205.

[12] Tertullian, *Prax.* 2,4.

[13] Rufin, *Orig. Comm. in Rom.Praef.*, (FChr 2/1) p. 59.

[14] Novatian, *Trin.* 27.

[15] Hippolyt, *Ref.* 9,12,17.

[16] Hippolyt, *Ref.* 9,12,16-19 does not say anything about *homoousios*.

[17] F. Dinsen, *Homousios* (Kiel 1978) 4-56.

[18] Athanasius, *Sent.Dion.* 18,2.

[19] Athanasius, *Decr.* 26.

[20] L. Abramowski, Dionys von Rom (†268) und Dionys von Alexandrien (†264/5) in den arianischen Streitigkeiten des 4. Jahrhunderts, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 93 (1982) 240-272.

[21] R.P.C. Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-151.

[22] R. Williams, *Arius. Heresy and Tradition*, London 1987, 48-61.

[23] H.C. Brennecke, Art. Nizäa, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 24 (1995) 431 f.

[24] Athanasius, *ep. Afr.* 2.—Cf. M. Aubineau, Les 318 serviteurs d'Abraham (Gen. XIV,14) et le nombre des Pères au Concile de Nicée (325), *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 61 (1966) 5-43, and H. Chadwick, Les 318 Pères de Nicée, *ibid.*, 808-811.

[25] *Patrum Nicaenorum Nomina*, ed. Gelzer/Hilgenfeldt/Cuntz, Nachdruck mit einem Vorwort von C. Markschies (Leipzig 1995) LXf.—Compare EOMIA I/1, ed. C.H. Turner, 35-91.

[26] For this date see T.D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass. 1982) 76.

[27] *Op. cit.*, no. 1 (= EOMIA, l.c., no. 1)

[28] *Op. cit.*, no. 1 (together with Ossius). (= EOMIA, l.c., no. 2).

[29] *Op. cit.*, no. 206. (= EOMIA, l.c., no. 205).

[30] *Op. cit.* no. 208. (= EOMIA, l.c., no. 207).

[31] *Op. cit.* no. 217. (= EOMIA, l.c., no. 215).

[32] *Op. cit.*, no. 218. (= EOMIA, l.c., no. 216).

[33] Patrum Nicaenorum nomina, p. 57: *Occidentalium uero nomina ideo non sunt scripta, quia nulla apud eos heresis suscipio fuit.*

[34] *Athanasius*, Werke III. Urkunden zum arianischen Streit, ed. H.G. Opitz, Urk. 20, p. 42, 2 f.

[35] Urk. 20, p. 42, 3 f.

[36] *Divine Substance* (Oxford 1977) 250-254; Art. Homoousios, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 16 (1992) 400-411.

[37] Tertullian, *Adv.Herm.* 44,3; *Val.* 12,5; 18,1; 37,2.

[38] Hilarius, *Coll.antiar.Paris.* B II,10.

[39] Augustinus, *Conf.* 8,2,3.

[40] Marius Victorinus, *Adv.Ar.* II,10. 12.

[41] C. Stead, *Divine substance* (Oxford 1977) 251.

[42] W. Bienert, *op. cit.*, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 90 (1979) p. 160: "Statistenrolle."

[43] This is true also for Athanasius, who took part as the deacon of his bishop Alexander.—A small note in a letter of the Eusebian bishops of Antioch, written 16 years after Nicaea, shows how important that difference in rank was to be taken. The Eusebian bishops defend themselves against the reproach of Arianism saying: "How should we who are bishops follow a presbyter (sc.: Arius)?" (Socrates, *hist.eccl.* 2,10).

[44] On Ossius see Victor de Clercq, *Ossius of Cordoba* (Washington 1954). Some criticism of De Clercqs views from A. Lippold, Bischof Ossius von Cordova und Konstantin der Große, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 92 (1981) 1-15, and J. Ulrich, Einige Bemerkungen zum angeblichen Exil des Ossius, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105 (1994) 143-155.

[45] Athanasius, *Hist.Ar.* 42,3.

[46] Basilius Caes., *Ep.* 81.

[47] *Ep. Eusebii ad Caes.* 7 (= Athanasius, Werke III, Urk. 22,7). Cf. Athanasius, *Decr.* 33; Socrates, *hist.eccl.* 1,8; Theodoret., *hist.eccl.* 1,12.

[48] *Divine Substance* (Oxford 1977) pp. 252 f.

[49] *Ep. Eusebii ad Caes.* 7 (= Athanasius, Werke III, Urk. 22,7).

[50] Eusebius Caes., *De Vita Constantini* 2,63.

[51] T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass. 1981).

[52] *Ep. Eusebii ad Caes.* 7 (= Athanasius, Werke III, Urk. 22,7). Translation according to Athanasius, Select works and letters, NPNF II/4 (Edinburgh 1987 [Reprint]), p. 75.

[53] Marcellus of Ancyra, *fr.* 81.

[54] R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh 1988) pp. 200 f.

[55] I do not regard Athanasius' account as being correct that Ossius was sent into exile to Sirmium and signed that creed only because he was forced to do so; some aspects of Athanasius' own texts and the tendency in all the other sources make it very likely that Ossius signed the creed of Sirmium voluntarily, because he wanted to contribute to a peaceful solution; cf. J. Ulrich, Einige Bemerkungen zum angeblichen Exil des Ossius, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105 (1994) 143-155.

[56] The homoean theology of the fifties of the fourth century was not entirely Arian, because it at least said that the Son was *like* the Father, whereas a real "Neo"-Arian (as, for example, Eunomius or Aetius) would have said *unlike*.

[57] Athanasius, *Apol.sec.* 36 f.; *Hist.Ar.* 16; 44,2-4.

[58] Hilarius, *De Syn.* 11.

[59] V. de Clercq, *Ossius of Cordova* (Washington 1954) p. 290.

[60] One might assume that Constantine came to see that if he were to stay in the East, he would need a local expert as adviser, not a Westerner like Ossius.

[61] For Athanasius see D.W.-H. Arnold, *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria*, (Notre Dame 1991) 143-173.

[62] L.W. Barnard, Pope Julius, Marcellus of Ancyra and the Council of Sardica. A reconsideration, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiéval* 38 (1971) p. 74.

[63] M. Tetz, Zum altrömischen Bekenntnis. Ein Beitrag des Marcellus von Ankyra, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75 (1984) 107-127; M. Vinzent, Die Gegner im Schreiben Markells an Julius von Rom, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 105 (1994) p. 287.

[64] K. Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra* (Berlin New York 1994) pp. 5 f. 8. 430.

[65] Epiphanius, *Adv. haereses* 72,2f. (GCS Epiphanius III, pp. 256-259) = Markell, *fr.* 129 (GCS Euseb IV, pp. 214 f.).

[66] M. Vinzent, *op. cit.*, 285-328.

[67] Ath., *apol.sec.* 32,3.

[68] Epiph., *haer.* 72,2.

[69] W.E.H. Turner, *The pattern of Christian Truth* (London 1954) p. 439 speaks of "Nicene extremism."

[70] Tert., *Adv.Prax.* 2,4; 12,7.

[71] See above, no. 35.

[72] Tert., *Adv.Prax.* 6,1; 7,5; 11,10; 12,4; 13,5; 14,1; 21,5.

[73] See for example the little anecdote of Ossius' interview with Narcissus of Neronias in A.D. 325 (Marcellus, *fr.* 81), when Narcissus says that he believes in three realities ("Persons") within God, what could be expressed by the term "three *hypostaseis/ousiai*" in Greek, but Ossius of Cordoba takes him to mean that there were three substances in the Godhead, a view that was entirely impossible to accept. The little scene does not at all suggest that Ossius was versed in the Greek debates and terminology (R.P.C. Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 200 f.). The situation in Rome A.D. 340 might not have been much different.

[74] L.W. Barnard, *The Council of Serdica 343 A.D.* (Sofia 1983). See also H. Hess, *The Canons of Serdica A.D. 343. A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law* (Oxford 1958).

[75] J. Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums* (Berlin New York 1994) pp. 91-95.

[76] Critical text and German translation in: J. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-59.

[77] EOMIA I/2, 644.

[78] See the following notes no. 79-82.

[79] Concilia Galliae (CChr.SL 148, p. 26).

[80] G. Bardy, L'Occident et les documents de la controverse arienne, *Recherches de science religieuse* 20 (1940) p. 40.

[81] Hil., *Coll.antiar.Paris.* B II,2,5.

[82] Mansi 3, 178.—See also T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius* (Cambridge, Mass. 1993) p. 262, no. 47 and V. de Clercq, *op. cit.*, pp. 407 f.

[83] Phoebadius, *Contra Arrianos*, written in early 358 (CChr.SL 64, pp. 3-52).

[84] Gregory of Elvira, *De fide orthodoxa*, first version written about 360, the second version about 364 (CChr.SL 69, pp. 217-247).

[85] Phoeb., *C.Ar.* 28,2 f.

[86] See J. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, 159-194: Common ideas in Phoebadius' tract and in the Western creed of Serdica: Both texts speak of equal eternity of God Father and Son; both see the difference between them in their different names; both say that the idea of different hypostaseis is from Arius (which, in fact, isn't quite true—it is Origen's) and that it tends to split up Father and Son; both authors argue against the "arian snakes" Valens and Ursacius.

[87] From Hilarius' Liber against Valens et Ursacius = Hilarius, Coll. antiariana Parisana B 2,10, which had been sent from Hilarius' exile in the east to Gaul in early A.D. 357.

[88] Phoeb., *C.Ar.* 6,3.

[89] Phoeb., *C.Ar.* 14,3.

[90] Tert., *Adv.Prax.* 6,1; 7,5; 11,10; 12,4; 13,5; 21,5.

[91] See J. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, 195-216: Like the Western creed of Serdica, Gregory speaks of the difference in name between God Father and Son, emphazises the "*unitatem substantiae*" (*Fid.orth.* 5), regards the term "unius substantiae" as Nicene (in fact he translates the Greek "*homoousios*" in the Nicene creed with "*unius substantiae*") and cites the same arsenal of objections against his opponents as the creed of Serdica had done.

[92] Hilarius, *Coll.antiar.Paris.* B II,10 and *De Syn.* 84.

[93] Lucifer of Calaris, *De non parc.* 18.—For the earliest Latin translations of the Nicene creed see G.L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Constantinopoli* (Rome 1967) pp. 91 f.

[94] Hilarius, *De Syn.* 91.—During his exile, however, he got in touch with theologians from the East, especially with the Homoiousians, and then was perfectly ready to see them as defenders of (the Nicene) orthodoxy. In his *Liber de Synodis seu Fide Orientalium* he tries to convince his Western colleagues in Gaul of this view.

[95] See R. Williams, Reassessment of the Early Career and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 42 (1991) 202-217.

96047 *Bamberg*, Weide 3

CICERO'S ORATOR AND JEROME[1]

BY

NEIL ADKIN

Hagendahl notes that Augustine makes more references to the *Orator* than to any other of Cicero's rhetorical treatises; fourteen quotations and twenty-one testimonies to this work are identified.[2] On the other hand only three references to the *Orator* are registered by the same scholar in his monograph on the debt of Jerome to the classics.[3] The first of these is an almost verbatim quotation of a sentence from the work's prologue (4), which Jerome employs in his own preface to the twelfth book of his commentary on Ezekiel: *"prima enim," ut ait sublimis orator, "quaeque sectanti, honestum est etiam in secundis tertiisve consistere"* (ll. 24-25). This passage of Cicero had also been cited by Quintilian (*inst.* 12,11,26).[4] However Jerome's inclusion of phraseology omitted in the Quintilianic version shows that here he is borrowing directly from Cicero's *Orator*.

The other two passages adduced by Hagendahl are less straightforward: both require more careful analysis than he accords them. The first is found in Jerome's *Dialogue against the Pelagians*, where he affirms: *Antonius enim orator egregius, in cuius laudibus Tullius personat, disertos se ait vidisse multos, eloquentem adhuc neminem* (3,17). Here Hagendahl merely compares *Orator* 18:[5] *M. Antonius, cui vel primas eloquentiae patrum nostrorum tribuebat aetas, vir natura peracutus et prudens . . . disertos ait se vidisse multos, eloquentem omnino neminem.* Again this text is cited by Quintilian (*inst.* 8 *prooem.* 13): *M. Antonius . . . cum a se disertos visos esse multos ait, eloquentem neminem.* However the specific phrasing that Jerome uses in the first half of the antithesis (*disertos se ait vidisse multos*) would seem to guarantee that these particular words have come straight from the *Orator*, which employs an almost identical formulation (*disertos ait se vidisse multos*). On the other hand Jerome's wording in the second half (*eloquentem adhuc neminem*) evinces a small but significant difference from that of both the *Orator* (*eloquentem omnino neminem*) and of Quintilian (*eloquentem neminem*). Hagendahl has failed to recognize that here Jerome is in fact dependent on Cicero's *De Oratore*,[6] where the same dictum had been placed

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

in Antonius' own mouth: *disertos me cognosse nonnullos, eloquentem adhuc neminem* (1,94). Jerome has accordingly appended the *De Oratore*'s wording of the second half of the antithesis with its distinctive *adhuc* to the *Orator*'s formulation of the first: such amalgamation of sources is typical of Jerome's method of composition.[7]

Two further points may be made in connection with the same passage. In the first place Hagendahl evidently regarded Cicero's brief comment on Antonius in this paragraph of the *Orator* (*cui vel primas eloquentiae patrum nostrorum tribuebat aetas, vir natura peracutus et prudens*) as the source for Jerome's glowing qualification of the same individual as *orator egregius, in cuius laudibus Tullius personat.* However it would seem unlikely that the *Orator*'s cursory gloss could have inspired such a potent term as *personare*;[8] here Jerome is more probably thinking of the *De Oratore*, in which Antonius is one of the two principal speakers.[9] Secondly Hagendahl does not mention that allusions to Antonius' dictum are frequent:[10] it is not therefore surprising that Jerome himself should have quoted these words.

The third and final debt to the *Orator* identified in Hagendahl's monograph occurs in Jerome's letter to Nepotian, which expounds the mode of life appropriate to a cleric. Here Jerome stipulates: *nolo te declamatorem esse et rabulam garrulumque* (*epist.* 52,8,1). Hagendahl refers to *Orator* 47: *non enim declamatorem aliquem de ludo aut rabulam de foro . . . quaerimus.*[11] In this connection Hagendahl fails to mention *De Oratore* 1,202: *non enim causidicum nescio quem neque [pro]clamatorem aut rabulam . . . conquirimus.* Here all manuscripts read *proclamatorem*, which is otherwise unattested; *clamatorem* is Ellendt's emendation. However the most recent editor of the *De Oratore* has signalled his approval for the reading *declamatorem.*[12] Accordingly this passage would now read: *non enim causidicum nescio quem neque declamatorem aut rabulam.* It is closer to Jerome's formulation than the *Orator*: whereas he and the *De Oratore* employ *declamatorem* and *rabulam* without any kind of adjunct, the *Orator* attaches *aliquem* to the former and an adjectival phrase to both (*declamatorem aliquem de ludo aut rabulam de foro*). While moreover the *Orator* uses only these two nouns, Jerome agrees with the *De Oratore* in adding a third.

On both occasions on which Hagendahl dealt with Jerome's sentence he left out its second half: *sed mysterii peritum et sacramentorum dei tui eruditissimum.* The *Orator* and the *De Oratore* each append a similarly positive stipulation beginning with *sed.* In the *Orator* it takes the form *sed doctissimum et perfectissimum quaerimus*; these words were likewise omitted by Hagendahl. While *perfectissimum* is irrelevant, it may be observed that *doctissimum* parallels Jerome's *peritum* and *eruditissimum.* On the other hand the point might

also be made that the passage of the *De Oratore* is equally concerned with inculcating erudition; there it is the subject of the long sentence which immediately precedes. Jerome's stress on learning is in any case determined by the context in which his statement occurs.[13] The knowledge to which Jerome here refers is scriptural; it is therefore noteworthy that he should have chosen to avail himself of such equivocal terminology as *mysterii* and *sacramentorum* in this connection.[14] The explanation is perhaps to be sought in the second half of the sentence from the *De Oratore*: *sed eum virum qui primum sit eius artis antistes*. The striking metaphor in *antistes* might be thought to have inspired Jerome's similarly hierophantic tone in the letter to Nepotian.

In an article published sixteen years after his monograph Hagendahl presented a series of "aftergleanings" which had been overlooked in his initial study; three further borrowings from the *Orator* were now identified in Jerome's *œuvre*.[15] The first is incontestable: *Orator* 27 had employed the phrase *more Asiatico canere*, which reappears in Jerome as *Asiatico more cantare* (*in Os.* 2,16, l. 430). Hagendahl notes that this echo had already been registered by Norden.[16] However Hagendahl's other two passages again call for a more thorough examination than they have so far received; it may be observed in this connection that Hagendahl fails to record their earlier identification by Luebeck.[17]

In the first of these passages Jerome declares that even Demosthenic eloquence could not adequately express the joy at Demetrias' conversion to virginity: *contortae Demosthenis vibrataeque sententiae tardius languidiusque ferrentur* (*epist.* 130,6,1). Hagendahl and Luebeck both adduce *Orator* 234: *cuius* (sc. Demosthenes) *non tam vibrarent fulmina illa, nisi numeris contorta ferrentur.* However neither refers to Quintilian's paraphrase of this passage: *"neque enim Demosthenis fulmina tantopere vibratura" dicit, "nisi numeris contorta ferrentur"* (*inst.* 9,4,55). There would seem to be grounds for supposing that Jerome is in fact thinking rather of the Quintilianic formulation.[18] On the one hand Jerome and Quintilian concur in the use of a participial form of *vibrare*,[19] whereas the *Orator* employs instead the finite verb; they also tally against Cicero in making the noun to which this participle is attached follow directly the dependent genitive *Demosthenis*. In Jerome this noun is *sententiae*, not *fulmina*; significantly the otherwise extremely rare collocation of *vibrare* and *sententia* occurs no fewer than three times in Quintilian.[20]

The last of the three additional borrowings from the *Orator* posited in Hagendahl's article is the single word *logodaedali*, which Jerome uses in his *Liber de optimo genere interpretandi* (*epist.* 57,7,7). Hagendahl observes that this term was coined by Plato at *Phaedrus* 266e; however he states that Jerome

has "certainly" taken it from *Orator* 39 (*multosque alios quos* λογοδαιδάλους *appellat in Phaedro Socrates*).[21] Such a categorical assertion would seem to be unwarranted. Kunst observed that the word had also occurred in Quintilian:[22] *quos Plato appellat* λογοδαιδάλους (*inst.* 3,1,11). With Latin writers of Jerome's own day this formation would in fact appear to have enjoyed a certain vogue. The noun *logodaedalia* had already been employed twice by Ausonius (349,1, p. 167; 403,26, p. 236).[23] In Servius the adjective is itself used as a gloss to elucidate another phrase (*Aen.* 9,599: *fandi fictor Ulixes*).[24]

Besides the two passages of Jerome just discussed Luebeck had also adduced two others in which he detected the influence of the *Orator*: both were ignored by Hagendahl.[25] In one of them Jerome remarks: *quia valde prudens erat et noverat illud, quod appellant philosophi* τὸ πρέπον, *id est decere, quod facias* (*epist.* 127,7,3). Here Luebeck assumed a debt to *Orator* 70: *ut enim in vita sic in oratione nihil est difficilius quam quid deceat videre*: πρέπον *appellant hoc Graeci, nos dicamus sane decorum*. However the term πρέπον is often employed by Latin authors, who regularly gloss it with *decorus* or *decere*.[26] The point may also be made that by the time Jerome wrote the letter in question he had been living in the Greek-speaking East for nearly thirty years.

If then Hagendahl rightly discounted this passage, he would seem to have been mistaken in rejecting Luebeck's other one. Here Jerome observes in the penultimate chapter of his *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*epist.* 22,40,1): *nihil amantibus durum est, nullus difficilis cupienti labor*. With this statement Luebeck compared *Orator* 33: *nihil difficile amanti puto*.[27] The idea in question was certainly a commonplace.[28] Nonetheless it is perhaps possible to show that Jerome's particular formulation is indeed indebted to the *Orator*. When Jerome employs a "proverbial" expression, he can be shown to utilize the specific wording of an author he knows well.[29] The phraseology of the *Orator* and of Jerome's *Libellus* shows a notable similarity: both share an initial *nihil*, a present participle of *amare* in the dative, and the epithet *difficilis*. None of the other examples of the idea hitherto identified presents such a resemblance.

At the same time Jerome has improved his source; such stylistic enhancement of borrowed material is another characteristic of his compositional method.[30] While retaining the three elements of Cicero's simple and economical formulation (*nihil difficile amanti*), Jerome has expanded them to create an asyndetic isocolon of great elegance in which each element now contains four words. Cicero's *difficilis* has been relegated to the second clause; Jerome has also juxtaposed the Ciceronian terms *nihil* and *amanti*,

while converting the latter into a plural. *Nihil* is now matched by *nullus . . . labor*; Jerome accordingly achieves the more subtle form of anaphora designated by the rhetoricians as *disiunctio*.[31] An initial alliteration (*nihil . . . nullus*) is also maintained, while the formulation *nullus . . . labor* makes possible a graceful hyperbaton that enfolds the whole clause. Jerome also pairs Cicero's *amanti* and *difficile* with his own *cupienti* and *durum* respectively.[32] The result of this expansion is a triply chiastic arrangement which is further enhanced by the alliteration in the neighbouring epithets *durum* and *difficile*: *nihil* (1) *amantibus* (2) *durum* (3) . . . *difficilis* (3) *cupienti* (2) *labor* (1). In addition the first two words of the second clause (*nullus difficilis*) exactly reproduce the syllabic pattern of the corresponding phrase in the first (*nihil amantibus*): in both a disyllable is followed by a word containing four syllables. On the other hand the greater length of the second half of the latter clause *vis à vis* the equivalent section of the antecedent one turns the whole sentence into an elegant exemplification of Behaghel's law.[33] The terminal phrase in question (*cupienti labor*) at the same time replicates the architectonics of the sentence's opening words (*nihil amantibus*), though in reverse sequence: each consists of a four-syllabled dative participle and a disyllabic nominative noun. Ellipse of the verb in the second clause preserves the symmetry with the first in terms of overall number of words. Finally both halves are characterized by a particularly choice clausula: while the first ends with a cretic spondee,[34] the second exhibits a choriamb cretic.[35] Jerome's own formulation of this commonplace is accordingly marked by a consummate artistry which far surpasses his Ciceronian source.

One further text can be added to the dossier of Jerome's borrowings from the *Orator*; it has hitherto escaped notice. A particularly interesting passage of the preface to Jerome's commentary on Ephesians replies to critics of his scriptural scholarship; here he begins with a formulation which goes back to Tertullian,[36] while the section ends with an attack on Ambrose.[37] In the middle of this passage Jerome expresses himself as follows: *me imperitior quisque lecturus est: tua forsitan dicta si scripseris, Tullius admirabitur. numquid aut Tertullianus beatum martyrem Cyprianum, aut Cyprianus Lactantium, aut Lactantius Hilarium deterruit a scribendo?* (p. 439[B-C]). The impressive *gradatio*[38] which occupies the second half of this text is preceded by a reference to *Tullius*. Kunst has drawn attention to Jerome's habit of mentioning Cicero by name immediately before imitating his phraseology;[39] a Ciceronian echo would accordingly be no surprise here.

Jerome was especially partial to appropriating material from the beginning of a work.[40] A borrowing from the preface of the *Orator* was the first

passage to be considered in the present article; it occurred in Jerome's own preface to book XII of his commentary on Ezekiel. The text just cited comes from the prologue of another of Jerome's scriptural commentaries; it too contains a debt to the same Ciceronian preface. The sentence of the *Orator* which ends with the words borrowed in the Ezekiel commentary is directly succeeded[41] by one containing the following statement: *nec vero Aristotelem in philosophia deterruit a scribendo amplitudo Platonis, nec ipse Aristoteles admirabili quadam scientia et copia ceterorum studia restinxit* (5).

This *gradatio* had already been imitated by Columella in the preface to *De re rustica*, which makes explicit reference (1 *praef.* 29) to this section of the *Orator*. There Columella had said: *nec Brutum aut Caelium Pollionemve cum Messala et Calvo deterruere ab eloquentiae studio fulmina illa Ciceronis. nam neque ipse Cicero territus cesserat tonantibus Demostheni Platonique, nec parens eloquentiae deus ille Maeonius vastissimis fluminibus facundiae suae posteritatis studia restinxerat* (1 *praef.* 30). Columella has increased the number of authors and substituted Latin ones for Greek; in both respects he anticipates Jerome. It would however be unwarranted to suppose that Jerome was familiar with this passage, since there is no evidence that he had read Columella.[42]

Jerome in fact follows Cicero's wording closely: unlike Columella both have in common the very rare collocation *deterrere a scribendo*.[43] At the same time Jerome has characteristically tightened up his source to produce an impressively concise three-tier *gradatio* from which virtually everything has been eliminated save the aforementioned verb-form and the names of four Church Fathers;[44] here the contrast with Columella's diffusiveness is particularly instructive. If however Jerome has again surpassed his source in rhetorical élan, it must be said that his plagiarism has produced an inconcinnity; such blemishes resulting from the incorporation of borrowed material are another feature of Jerome's work.[45] The *gradatio* in both Cicero and Jerome involves writers of equal quality. In the *Orator* this arrangement had been appropriate, since Cicero's point was that the predecessor's distinction did not put off his successor, who turned out to be equally distinguished: high standards should not deter. Jerome on the other hand is contrasting the distinction of others with his own inadequacy. Here a *gradatio* of equals is out of place. The inconsistency supplies convenient verification that Jerome is borrowing from elsewhere.

Jerome's *gradatio* is followed immediately by further professions of his own insufficiency. The transition is effected by the following rather awkward statement: *taceo de ceteris minutalibus, qui mecum in libris suis garriunt.* Jerome then proceeds to append three short sentences which all make the

same point: *nisi et parva fuerint, magna eminere non possunt. primum non dicitur, nisi secundum sequatur et tertium. ad summa non scandimus, nisi per ima gradiamur.* Here too Jerome is indebted to the *Orator.* Cicero's *gradatio* had been accompanied by a threefold assertion of the general principle that the first-rate does not invalidate what is inferior. This triad has evidently inspired Jerome's own; however Cicero's point has been modified to suit Jerome's self-depreciatory purpose: only inferiority like his own makes the first-rate possible. Again the Ciceronian expansiveness has been replaced by a characteristic concision.

The first of Cicero's sentences ends as follows: *prima enim sequentem honestum est in secundis tertiisque consistere* (4). It has already been noted that these words were employed in Jerome's commentary on Ezekiel. Clearly they are also the source of his second sentence here: *primum non dicitur, nisi secundum sequatur et tertium.* Both statements are constructed according to the sequence *primus . . . secundus . . . tertius.*[46] However Jerome's appropriation of this series again entails a slight inconcinnity. While Cicero had quite properly been making concrete reference to second- and third-rate orators, Jerome's abstract formulation is strictly inaccurate: the "first" is only defined in relation to the "second," not the "third."

Cicero's third sentence is exceptionally long; it is decked out with discursive exemplification from the plastic arts. Its final words are the following: *cum summa miraremur, inferiora tamen probaremus* (5). They have evidently suggested the phrasing of Jerome's last sentence: *ad summa non scandimus, nisi per ima gradiamur.* In both Cicero and Jerome these statements occupy the third and final position. Each rests on the antithesis between "high" and "low"; while Jerome keeps his source's *summa*, the Ciceronian *inferiora* has been modified to *ima* in line with Jerome's self-abasement. It will be argued below that his further adaptation of the two verbs is due to the influence of a second source.

Earlier in the present article it was observed how Quintilian could serve as an intermediary between Cicero and Jerome. A similar phenomenon would seem to be observable in this passage of the prologue to Jerome's commentary on Ephesians. Here however both Cicero and Quintilian have been laid under contribution: attention has also been drawn above to Jerome's practice of making such simultaneous use of two different sources. The section of the *Orator*'s preface currently at issue had been imitated by Quintilian himself at the very end of his *Institutio Oratoria* (12,11,26-28); it is from the conclusion as well as the beginning of a work that Jerome borrows most heavily.[47] Here Quintilian had eschewed a *gradatio*; however

he quotes the final words of the first of Cicero's three statements vindicating the second-best.[48] Cicero's second sentence is then reformulated.[49]

Quintilian now goes on to add an observation of his own: *quin immo si hanc cogitationem homines habuissent, ut nemo se meliorem fore eo, qui optimus fuisset, arbitraretur, ii ipsi, qui sunt optimi, non fuissent, nec post Lucretium ac Macrum Vergilius nec post Crassum et Hortensium Cicero* (12,11,27). The second half of this statement would seem to have given Jerome his cue for the first of the three short sentences following his *gradatio*, where a comparable idea is expressed with typical terseness: *nisi et parva fuerint, magna eminere non possunt.* In particular the Quintilianic phrase *ii ipsi, qui sunt optimi, non fuissent* would appear to have inspired Jerome's *magna eminere non possunt.*[50] Jerome's substitution of *parva* for the likes of Lucretius, Macer, Crassus and Hortensius is once again due to his self-depreciation.

After a very brief digression on the value of oratory Quintilian returns to the theme of the best and the second-best. Here he declares: *nitamurque semper ad optima, quod facientes aut evademus in summum aut certe multos infra nos videbimus* (12,11,30). Since it was noted above how Quintilian imitates the first and second of the Ciceronian sentences dealing with the same topic, it is perhaps possible that in his use of the terms *summum* and *infra* here he is indebted to the third: *cum summa miraremur, inferiora tamen probaremus.* The point was made above that this statement of Cicero's has inspired the last of Jerome's triad of sentences: *ad summa non scandimus, nisi per ima gradiamur.* However if Jerome's antithesis between *summa* and *ima* has come from the *Orator*, his remarkable use of the metaphor of "ascent" would seem to have been suggested by Quintilian: *aut evademus in summum aut certe multos infra nos videbimus.* Apart from a four-line envoi these are the very last words of the *Institutio Oratoria*; they will accordingly have impressed themselves firmly on Jerome's highly retentive mind. The result of this borrowing from two separate authors is a very impressive formulation. Once again however it entails a flaw: whereas Jerome's first two sentences had presented a clear polarity between excellence and its opposite, here the same individual is inappropriately represented as being both superior and inferior.

Two final passages require examination in this connection. The first occurs in Jerome's letter to Desiderius (*epist.* 47), which was written several years after the commentary on Ephesians.[51] Here Jerome speaks of his addressee in the following terms: *scribendo disertissime deterruit ne scriberem* (47,1,2). Hagendahl asserts confidently that Jerome's statement has been inspired by the appraisal which Cicero gives of Caesar's *Commentaries* at

Brutus 262:[52] *dum voluit alios habere parata, unde sumerent qui vellent scribere historiam, ineptis gratum fortasse fecit, qui volent illa calamistris inurere; sanos quidem homines a scribendo deterruit.*[53] It would seem however that Hagendahl can be shown to be wrong.

Hagendahl does not observe that Jerome's immediately preceding sentence runs: *scis enim dogma nostrum humilitatis tenere vexillum et per ima gradientes ad summa nos scandere* (47,1,1). The second half of this statement exactly reproduces the wording of Jerome's commentary on Ephesians: *ad summa non scandimus, nisi per ima gradiamur.*[54] Clearly therefore these words of the epistle to Desiderius are a *Selbstzitat.*[55] In the Ephesians commentary the same formulation was juxtaposed with the expression *deterruit a scribendo.* When therefore in letter 47 Jerome uses the phrase *deterruit ne scriberem*, he is simply engaging in further self-imitation from the same passage of his commentary on Ephesians. It has already been noted that Jerome is partial to *Selbstzitate* in which the wording involved has in the first instance come from another writer.[56] We have another such instance here: Jerome's ultimate source is not the *Brutus*, but the *Orator.*[57]

Several instances have been adduced above of Jerome's penchant for enhancing the phraseology borrowed from other authors; he applies the same stylistic improvement to formulations that have been taken from earlier works of his own.[58] In the present passage of letter 47 Jerome is deprecating the praise which Desiderius had lavished on his eloquence. It is therefore natural that the language in which he expresses himself should be especially refined. This is particularly true of Jerome's most categorical affirmation of his supposed inadequacy: *scribendo disertissime deterruit ne scriberem.* Here the phrasing of the Ephesians commentary (*deterruit a scribendo*), which is also that of the *Orator*, has been modified for artistic effect: the result is an utterance as succinct as it is impressive. Polyptotic *redditio* (*scribendo . . . scriberem*) encompasses the whole.[59] These forms of *scribo* enclose two further words which are also aurally paired: the correspondence of their respective first halves (*disert-/deter-*) goes beyond mere alliteration to approach *adnominatio.* The entire phrase accordingly evinces a perfectly symmetrical chiastic arrangement: if *ne* is linked enclitically to the foregoing *deterruit*, two adjacent five-syllable units are enfolded by two trisyllables. This elegant structure also accommodates a graceful spondee-cretic clausula.[60] Again Jerome has outdone his source, which is this time himself.

The second and last passage to be considered is found in the preface to Jerome's *Dialogue against the Pelagians*, where he rebuts the charge that his motive for writing is envy. Here he asks with reference to Rufinus: *num*

invidemus ei, quia respondimus, et tanta in illo eloquentiae fuere flumina ut me a scribendi atque dictandi studio deterreret? (2). Again Hagendahl affirms that Jerome is indebted to the Ciceronian estimate of Caesar's *Commentaries* at *Brutus* 262 which was quoted above.[61] There however Cicero had made no reference to eloquence. Such wording had on the other hand opened Jerome's dictum in the epistle to Desiderius (*scribendo disertissime deterruit, ne scriberem*). The occurrence of the same reference to "eloquence" in the protasis of the present formulation (*tanta . . . eloquentiae . . . flumina ut me a scribendi . . . studio deterreret*) would accordingly seem to indicate that here we have another case of self-imitation: Jerome's debt is not to the *Brutus*, but to his own forty-seventh letter. This epistle predates the *Dialogue against the Pelagians* by over twenty years; however it is not unusual for Jerome's *Selbstzitate* to be separated by such a considerable length of time.[62]

Jerome was in the habit of attacking Rufinus' inarticulateness.[63] Since his disdain was obviously sincere, he felt no need to strive for rhetorical effect in the present passage, which accordingly forgoes the stylistic finesse of the letter to Desiderius. Jerome's preoccupation with Rufinus' want of eloquence no doubt accounts for the occurrence of the same theme here; the particular wording however has come from epistle 47. Once again the borrowing entails a slight blemish, since this time the phrase *ut me a scribendi . . . studio deterreret* is not quite *à propos*: in this section of his preface Jerome is concerned exclusively with envy as a motive for writing, not with reasons for *not* writing.[64]

One final observation may be briefly made. All the passages listed by Hagendahl in which Jerome is certainly indebted to the *Orator* are relatively late.[65] The present study has drawn attention to two borrowings which are substantially earlier: the *Libellus de virginitate servanda* was composed in 384, while the commentary on Ephesians may postdate it by as little as two years.[66]

NOTES

[1] Citation of works follows the method of *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index Librorum Scriptorum Inscriptionum* (Leipzig ²1990).

[2] H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics* (Göteborg 1967) (Stud. Gr. Lat. Gothob., 20) 554.

[3] H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers* (Göteborg 1958) (Act. Univ. Gothob., 64,2) 401.

[4] For Jerome's intimate acquaintance with Quintilian's treatise cf. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 412.

[5] Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 266. He is followed by C. Moreschini, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera 3,2: Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* (Turnhout 1990) (CCSL, 80) 121.

[6] For Jerome's thorough knowledge of the *De Oratore* cf. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 401, where eleven passages are listed; the present one is not among them.

[7] Cf. the present writer, Jerome as Centoist: *Epist.* 22,38,7, *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 28 (1992) 461-471. It may be noted that Hagendahl is not alone in overlooking this borrowing from the *De Oratore*. In their *apparatus criticus* to the corresponding passage of the *Orator*, which instead of *adhuc* has *omnino*, both P. Reis, *M. Tulli Ciceronis . . . Orator* (Leipzig 1932; repr. Stuttgart 1963) 6 and R. Westman, *M. Tulli Ciceronis . . . Orator* (Leipzig 1980) 5 cite Jerome's *adhuc* as if it were a *varia lectio*; they too fail to realize that he is quoting the *De Oratore* instead.

[8] Hagendahl himself follows the older editions in adopting the even stronger expression *pertonare*.

[9] Jerome refers to the treatise in the following terms: *tria volumina De Oratore in quibus introducit* (sc. Tullius) *eloquentissimos illius temporis oratores, Crassum et Antonium, disputantes* (*adv. Rufin.* 1,16). He may also have had in mind Cicero's extensive commendation of Antonius' oratorical gifts in the *Brutus* (138-144); for Jerome's familiarity with this work cf. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 399.

[10] Besides the passages adduced above cf. Cic. *orat.* 33; 69; 100; 105; *de orat.* 3,54; 3,189; Quint. *inst.* 12,1,21; Plin. *epist.* 5,20,5. None of these references is literal enough to have influenced Jerome's wording.

[11] Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 194, n. 2; 286. This passage of the *Orator* had already been linked to Jerome's formulation by C. Kunst, *De S. Hieronymi studiis Ciceronianis* (Vienna and Leipzig 1918) (Diss. Philol. Vindob., 12,2) 190. Kunst also detects an echo of another text of the *Orator* in this same chapter of the letter to Nepotian. Jerome's next sentence begins: *verba volvere et celeritate dicendi . . . admirationem sui facere . . .* (8,1). He then tells an anecdote about his teacher Gregory Nazianzen, which concludes as follows: *nihil tam facile, quam vilem plebiculam . . . linguae volubilitate decipere* (8,2). In these two sentences Kunst sees a debt to *Orator* 53: *flumen aliis verborum volubilitasque cordi est, qui ponunt in orationis celeritate eloquentiam.* However in the same note Kunst himself cites two other Ciceronian texts which in fact provide a closer parallel: *Brut.* 246 (*celeriter sane verba volvens*) and *Planc.* 62 (*linguae volubilitas*).

[12] K.F. Kumaniecki, *M. Tulli Ciceronis . . . De Oratore* (Leipzig 1969) 78. This emendation goes back to Piderit and Klotz. While not admitting it to his text, Kumaniecki states in his *apparatus criticus*: "quod etiam probari potest."

[13] The sentence which comes directly before it runs: *sermo presbyteri scripturarum lectione conditus sit.* The same theme pervades the immediately succeeding anecdote about Gregory Nazianzen, which castigates his ignorance in scriptural matters; cf. *inperitum* (p. 429, l. 1 in the edition of I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi epistulae* 1 [Vienna and Leipzig 1910] [CSEL, 54]); *indoctorum* (ll. 1-2); *nescit* (l. 3); *scientiam* (l. 3); *scire* (l. 8); *nescis* (l. 8); *indoctam* (l. 10); *non intellegit* (l. 11). The issue of ignorance in fact runs right to the end of this chapter; cf. *inperitis* (l. 15); *non didicerunt* (p. 430, ll. 7-8). Similarly the previous chapter had opened with a passionate and lengthy exhortation to acquire a thorough knowledge of scripture. On these two chapters cf. further the present writer, Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome: Some Remarks, in: M.A. Flower and M. Toher (edd.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* (London 1991) 13-24, at 19-20; *id.*, Jerome, Ambrose and Gregory Nazianzen (Jerome, *Epist.* 52,7-8), *Vichiana* n.s. 4 (1993) 294-300.

[14] Both words cover a very wide and somewhat nebulous range of meanings; for *mysterium* cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 8 coll. 1754,21–1755,28; 1755,57–1757,8; for *sacramentum* cf. C. Mohrmann, Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens, *Harvard Theological Review* 47 (1954) 141-152; reprinted in C. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* 1 (Rome ²1961) 233-244; R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum: Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien* (Paris ²1977) 435-443. It is of course true that each term can be used in association with scripture; for *mysterium* cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 8 coll. 1755,66-74; 1756,7-13; 29-33; 41-45; for *sacramentum* cf. (e.g.) Aug. *util. cred.* 17,35. The point may however be made that all the instances of *mysterium* adduced by the *Thesaurus* in this connection are either employed in explicit contrast to the literal interpretation or make specific reference to a particular section of the bible; neither is the case in Jerome's epistle to Nepotian. Finally it may be observed that immediately beforehand Jerome speaks in very concrete terms of *scripturarum lectione*; in view of such specificity it is accordingly somewhat surprising that he should not have adopted a less ambiguous form of expression than *mysterium* and *sacramenta*.

[15] H. Hagendahl, Jerome and the Latin Classics, *Vigiliae Christianae* 28 (1974) 216-227, at 220-221.

[16] E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Leipzig 1898) 635, n. 1.

[17] A. Luebeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit* (Leipzig 1872) 133.

[18] In a review of Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) in *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 3 (1960) 146-148, at 147 I. Opelt criticized the author for his failure to consider "die Möglichkeit des Zitats aus zweiter Hand." In this connection Opelt referred only to Seneca, Martial and Plautus; she herself failed to entertain the possibility that an intermediary could also have been involved in quotations from Cicero. Here the point may be made that a citation in such an intervenient work is necessarily set off from the context; its wording accordingly makes a stronger impression on the memory.

[19] It may be noted that the *Ambrosianus*, which is the oldest surviving codex for this passage of Quintilian, has *vibrata* instead of *vibratura*; its reading accordingly matches Jerome's *vibratae* exactly.

[20] Viz. *inst.* 10,1,60 (for another borrowing by Jerome from this section of the work cf. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* [n. 3] 158, n. 2); 11,3,120; 12,9,3. The last two passages are particularly striking because of the addition of *iaculantur* and *velut missilibus* respectively, which call to mind *contorta ferrentur* in the text currently at issue. The articles on *sententia* and *vibrare* in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* have not yet appeared; however *CETEDOC Library of Christian Latin Texts* (Turnhout 1994) supplies no example of this collocation besides the present passage of Jerome, while *Packard Humanities Institute* CD ROM #5.3 provides only the three above-mentioned texts of Quintilian and Petron. 118,2. There is no evidence that Jerome had read Petronius; cf. Luebeck, *op. cit.* (n. 17) 193 and Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 258 with n. 1; 284.

[21] While omitting to mention Luebeck, *op. cit.* (n. 17), Hagendahl did note that Jerome's debt to this passage had already been affirmed by P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (Paris 1948) 57, n. 11. Hagendahl's "certainly" evidently reproduces Courcelle's "sans doute."

[22] Kunst, *op. cit.* (n. 11) 193.

[23] Reference is made to these Ausonian passages by G.J.M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus, Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epist. 57): Ein Kommentar* (Leiden 1980) 87.

[24] In view of the foregoing evidence it is of course unnecessary to assume that Jerome was familiar with Plato's *Phaedrus*. On the other hand the possibility of such acquaintance should not be dismissed out of hand; cf. the present writer, Plato or Plautus? (Jerome, *Epist.* 22,30,2), *Emerita* 62 (1994) 43-56. Since the *Phaedrus* deals specifically with rhetoric, it would have been of particular interest to Jerome. On Ambrose's use of this dialogue cf. P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin* (Paris 1950) 312-319. For inconclusive evidence of Jerome's own familiarity with it cf. *id.*, *op. cit.* (n. 21) 56-57 with n. 11.

[25] Altogether Luebeck registered six passages; his first two were the ones from Jerome's Ezekiel commentary and *Dialogue against the Pelagians* that were discussed at the start of the present article. Luebeck merely listed them without comment.

[26] Cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 5,1 col. 216,82-83.

[27] Westman, *op. cit.* (n. 7) 10 (*ad loc.*) also suspected ("fort.") an echo in Jerome.

[28] Cf. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig 1890) 17 (no. 74); R. Häussler, *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer* (Hildesheim 1968) 94-95; 129; 232; 259; the present writer, Some Further Additions to Otto's Sprichwörter, *Sileno* 19 (1993) 361-372, at 372, n. 69.

[29] Cf. the present writer, *Istae sunt, quae solent dicere*: Three Roman Vignettes in Jerome's *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Epist.* 22), *Museum Helveticum* 49 (1992) 131-140, at 138-139 with n. 49.

[30] Cf. the present writer, Some Features of Jerome's Compositional Technique in the *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Epist.* 22), *Philologus* 136 (1992) 234-255.

[31] For the term cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich 1960) 319-320 (section 630).

[32] Besides lexical *variatio* Jerome's *amantibus* and *cupienti* also present a contrast of number.

[33] On this feature cf. M. von Albrecht, *Masters of Roman Prose from Cato to Apuleius*, updated Engl. transl. by the present writer (Leeds 1989) index *s. v.*

[34] Cf. M.C. Herron, *A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome* (Washington 1937) (Cath. Univ. Am. Patr. Stud., 51) 12-16.

[35] Cf. Herron, *op. cit.* (n. 34) 59-61.

[36] Viz. *quibus cum possim districtius respondere* (p. 439[A]). According to P. Petitmengin, Saint Jérôme et Tertullien, in: Y.-M. Duval (ed.), *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient* (Paris 1988) 48, n. 38 Jerome is here echoing Tert. *idol.* 5,1: *iam illa obici solita vox, non habeo aliud quo vivam, districtius repercuti potest: vivere ergo habes? quid tibi cum deo est, si tuis legibus vivis?.* While this Tertullianic text constitutes Jerome's ultimate source, Petitmengin is wrong to affirm that he is directly dependent on it in the present passage ("il s'en souvient sans doute dans le prologue de l'*in Eph.*"). Petitmengin notes that Jerome had earlier imitated the same sentence of the *De idololatria* in his *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*epist.* 22,11,1): *quodsi volueris respondere te . . . non posse . . . his legibus vivere, districtius respondebo: vive ergo lege tua, quae dei non potes.* Whereas Tertullian had said *districtius repercuti*, Jerome here employs the phrase *districtius respondebo.* The same wording is repeated in the commentary on Ephesians: *districtius respondere.* The latter passage accordingly evinces a direct dependence on the *Libellus*, not on Tertullian. For further exemplification of this kind of *Selbstzitat* in which the formulation at issue is ultimately due to another author cf. the present writer, Falling Asleep Over a Book: Jerome, *Letter* 60,11,2, *Eos* 81 (1993) 227-230. On this sentence of the *Libellus* cf. further *id.*, Tertullian's *De Idololatria* and Jerome, *Augustinianum* 33 (1993) 11-30, at 13-14.

[37] Viz. *cum aliud sit proprios libros componere, verbi gratia, de avaritia, et de fide, de virginitate, de viduis, et super unaquaque materia testimoniis scripturarum hinc inde quaesitis eloquentiam iungere saecularem, et paene in communibus locis pompaticum iactare sermonem* (p. 440[B]). Jerome's target here has recently been identified as Ambrose by S.M. Oberhelman, Jerome's Earliest Attack on Ambrose: *On Ephesians*, Prologue (ML 26:469D-70A), *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 121 (1991) 377-401. Oberhelman has failed to notice that this identification had already been made by W. Dunphy, On the Date of St. Ambrose's *De Tobia*, *Sacris Erudiri* 27 (1984) 27-36, at 29-33. Nor is the present passage Jerome's "earliest attack" on Ambrose, which is to be found instead in his *Libellus de virginitate servanda*; cf. the present writer, Ambrose and Jerome: The Opening Shot, *Mnemosyne* 46 (1993) 364-376.

[38] On this rhetorical figure cf. Lausberg, *op. cit.* (n. 31) 315-317 (section 623).

[39] Kunst, *op. cit.* (n. 11) 183, n. 5.

[40] Cf. Petitmengin, *art. cit.* (n. 36) 50 ("c'est-à-dire aux passages qui restent le mieux gravés dans la mémoire").

[41] The punctuation followed in the present article is that of the editions by A. Yon, *Cicéron: L'Orateur, Du meilleur genre d'orateurs* (Paris 1964); A.S. Wilkins, *M. Tulli Ciceronis rhetorica* 2 (Oxford 1903; repr. 1960); W. Friedrich, *M. Tulli Ciceronis opera rhetorica* 2 (Leipzig 1902).

[42] Cf. Luebeck, *op. cit.* (n. 17) 227; Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 401.

[43] *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae s. v. deterreo* adduces only two other instances (5,1 col. 807,28 and 61: Cic. *Brut.* 262 and Cels. 6,18,1). The electronic disks listed in n. 20 above add no further example.

[44] Jerome's principal reason for substituting patristic authors for Cicero's philosophers is no doubt his scriptural subject-matter. It may also be observed that in this commentary he repeatedly attacks philosophy; cf. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 124 with n. 2.

[45] Cf. the present writer, *art. cit.* (n. 30) esp. 236-238.

[46] It may also be noted that each contains the verb *sequor*.

[47] Cf. Petitmengin, *art. cit.* (n. 36) 50.

[48] *Est, ut Cicero ait, pulchrum "in secundis tertiisque consistere"* (12,11,26).

[49] Cicero had said: *nam in poetis non Homero soli locus est, ut de Graecis loquar, aut Archilocho aut Sophocli aut Pindaro, sed horum vel secundis vel etiam infra secundos* (4). Quintilian's adaptation runs: *neque enim si quis Achillis gloriam in rebus bellicis consequi non potest, Aiacis aut Diomedis laudem aspernabitur nec, qui Homeri non fuerunt, <non fuerunt> Tyrtaei* (12,11,27).

[50] Quintilian himself had used the word *magna* with similar reference in conjunction with *optimum* in the sentence immediately preceding his literal quotation from the *Orator* (above, n. 48).

[51] A date of 386 is assigned to this commentary by P. Nautin, La date des commentaires de Jérôme sur les épîtres pauliniennes, *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 74 (1979) 5-12; however it had been placed after 388-389 by F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme: Sa vie et son œuvre* 1,2 (Louvain and Paris 1922) (Spic. Sacr. Lovan., 2) 27. Letter 47 belongs to 393; cf. *ib.* 43.

[52] Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 265.

[53] This is one of the only two other texts in which the locution *deterrere a scribendo* is attested; cf. n. 43 above.

[54] No parallel is provided by *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae ss. vv. gradior, imus* (6,2 coll. 2137,31–2142,26; 7,1 coll. 1398,80–1403,72; the articles on *scando* and *summus* have not

yet appeared) or by the electronic disks mentioned in n. 20 above.

[55] It may be remarked that they again involve an imperfection. In the Ephesians commentary the antithesis between "high" and "low" had been the *raison d'être* of the entire passage. In this letter on the other hand Jerome is referring only to what is "low" (*humilitatis*); here mention of *summa* is not *à propos*.

[56] Cf. n. 36 above.

[57] Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 399 in fact lists only one other passage of the *Brutus* to which Jerome certainly alludes.

[58] Cf. the present writer, Self-imitation in Jerome's *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Epist.* 22), *Athenaeum* n. s. 83 (1995) 469-485.

[59] On *redditio* in general cf. Lausberg, *op. cit.* (n. 31) 317-318 (section 625). For the additional refinement of polyptoton in conjunction with this figure cf. *ib.* 329 (section 648,5).

[60] Cf. Herron, *op. cit.* (n. 34) 36-40.

[61] Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 265.

[62] Cf. the present writer, Tertullian's *De Idololatria* and Jerome Again, *Mnemosyne* 49 (1996) 46-52, at 48, n. 13, where further exemplification involving a similar time-lapse is adduced.

[63] For the evidence cf. the present writer, *Alii discunt—pro pudor!—a feminis*: Jerome, *Epist.* 53,7,1, *Classical Quarterly* n. s. 44 (1994) 559-561.

[64] In Jerome's enumeration of the authors against whom he had written Rufinus is immediately preceded by Jovinian, whose literary capability he also despised; here Jovinian is qualified as *tam elinguis et sic sermonis putidi ut magis misericordia dignus fuerit quam invidia*. Unlike the derivative reference to Rufinus, this formulation involves no inconcinnity.

[65] The earliest is from the commentary on Hosea, which belongs to 406.

[66] Cf. n. 51 above.

University of Nebraska at *Lincoln*

WAS NÜTZT EIN FEIND? EINE KYNISCHE MAXIME IN DER ANTIKEN CHRISTLICHEN LITERATUR

VON

ALFONS FÜRST

In der antiken christlichen Literatur begegnet ein Topos, den man eigentlich woanders her kennt. Gemeint ist der Gedanke, von Feinden könne man nicht nur Schaden, sondern auch Nutzen haben. Die Ansicht, wer klug und weise sei, könne von Feinden viel lernen, und das manchmal besser und schneller als von Freunden, findet sich zum ersten Mal in Aristophanes' Komödie "Die Vögel."[1] Stellenwert und Bekanntheitsgrad dieses Topos in der paganen Antike lassen sich daraus ersehen, daß Plutarch in seinen "Moralia" darüber eine eigene Abhandlung geschrieben[2] und daß Johannes Stobaeus ihm in seiner (wahrscheinlich) im 5. Jahrhundert n. Chr. zusammengestellten Anthologie ein ganzes Kapitel gewidmet hat, das nicht erhalten geblieben ist, dessen Überschrift wir aber aus der "Bibliothek" des byzantinischen Gelehrten Photius, des Patriarchen von Konstantinopel im 9. Jahrhundert, kennen: "Darüber, wie man von Feinden Nutzen hat."[3] Ovids Ausruf in den "Metamorphosen" schließlich, auch vom Feind müsse man lernen,[4] wurde noch im Mittelalter zitiert, und zwar in einem Brief Abaelards an Heloïsa, in einem des Petrus Venerabilis an dieselbe Adressatin sowie von Peter von Blois.[5]

Bei christlichen Autoren der Antike trifft man nicht nur auf diesen Topos vom Feindesnutzen im allgemeinen, sondern auch auf eine spezielle Variante. Zwei profilierte Zeugen, Augustinus und Johannes Chrysostomus, brachten an einigen wenigen Stellen einen ganz bestimmten Nutzen zur Sprache, den man von einem Feind, und von diesem sogar in ganz besonderer Weise, haben könne. Es ging ihnen, besonders Chrysostomus, um den Gewinn, den man aus feindlicher Kritik und Beschimpfung für das eigene moralische wie intellektuelle Fortkommen ziehen könne. Auch diese spezielle Version war schon in der paganen Antike bekannt, doch finden sich davon nur relativ wenige Spuren. Die verstreuten Zeugnisse, die sich dazu

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 40-50

beibringen lassen, sind aber alles in allem doch so viele und in ihrer jeweiligen Formulierung so prägnant, daß Herkunft, Verbreitung und Sinn dieser Ansicht noch erkennbar sind.

Der Nutzen feindlicher Kritik (Augustinus)

In dem Werk über die Trinität hat Augustinus im Proöm zum zweiten Buch ausdrücklich auf seine Offenheit für Kritik und auf seine Bereitschaft hingewiesen, gerade in so schwierigen Problemen wie dem der Dreifaltigkeit des einen Gottes dazuzulernen: "Lieber will ich, von wem auch immer, kritisiert, als von einem, der sich irrt, oder einem, der mir schmeichelt, gelobt werden. Denn wer die Wahrheit liebt"—wörtlich sprach Augustinus von einem "Liebhaber der Wahrheit" (*amator veritatis*)—, "der braucht keinen Kritiker zu fürchten. Es wird nämlich entweder ein Feind die Kritik vorbringen oder ein Freund. Wenn nun ein Feind spottet und höhnt, muß man ihn ertragen. Einen Freund aber muß man, wenn er sich irrt, über das Richtige aufklären. Hat er jedoch recht, muß man auf ihn hören."[6] Mit diesen Worten bekundete Augustinus eine unterschiedliche Reaktion auf Kritik von seiten eines Freundes und auf solche von seiten eines Feindes. Während er sich von einem Freund belehren lassen wollte, falls dieser recht habe, qualifizierte er die Kritik eines Feindes von vornherein als ein Spotten und Höhnen (*insultare*), das man eben zu ertragen habe.

Im selben Buch kam Augustinus allerdings noch einmal auf seine Bereitschaft zur Akzeptanz zutreffender Kritik zu sprechen. Diesmal gab er en passant eine andere Einstellung gegenüber feindlicher Kritik zu erkennen: Er sei nicht nur bereit, sich korrigieren zu lassen, wenn er "in brüderlicher Weise" und zu Recht kritisiert werde, sondern er sei dazu auch bereit, wenn er von einem Feind angegriffen—wörtlich: "gebissen"—werde, vorausgesetzt, dieser sage die Wahrheit.[7] Hier hat Augustinus ernst gemacht mit der im Proöm getroffenen Aussage, ein "Liebhaber der Wahrheit" brauche sich vor *keinem* Kritiker zu fürchten. Unwichtig sei der Stil von Kritik ("in brüderlicher Weise" oder "bissig"), unwichtig auch die Person des Kritikers (sei's ein Freund, sei's ein Feind). Entscheidend sei vielmehr, ob die Kritik in der Sache zutreffend sei oder nicht. In Kritik von seiten eines Feindes sah Augustinus damit—immer unter der Voraussetzung ihrer sachlichen Berechtigung—genauso einen Anstoß zum Überdenken der eigenen Position wie in Kritik von seiten eines Freundes.

Er ging sogar noch einen Schritt weiter. In einem Brief an Hieronymus meinte er, Freunde würden "berechtigtem Freimut (*libertas iustitiae*) weniger

Freiraum als erforderlich einräumen, da sie befürchten, damit der Süße der Freundschaft (*dulcedo amicitiae*) einen bitteren Beigeschmack zu geben"; Feinde hingegen "sagen, wenn sie schimpfen, bisweilen Wahres, was uns zur Besserung dienen kann."[8] Eine ähnliche Bemerkung machte er in den "Bekenntnissen" anläßlich der Erzählung einer Jugendsünde seiner Mutter Monnica: Als kleines Mädchen von den Eltern zum Weinholen geschickt, habe sie jedesmal von dem Schöpfbecher genippt, erst wenig, dann immer mehr. Von der Magd, die das mitbekam, als "kleine Säuferin" (*meribibula*) beschimpft, habe sie ihr falsches Verhalten eingesehen und sogleich eingestellt. Augustins lapidarer Kommentar dazu: "Wie schmeichelnde Freunde uns verderben, dienen uns schimpfende Feinde meist zur Besserung."[9] Feinde betrachtete Augustinus demnach sogar als bessere und nützlichere Kritiker als Freunde.

Der Nutzen feindlicher Kritik—ein kynischer Gedanke

Vom wem stammt dieser Topos? Wo Augustinus ihn gelernt hat, ist bekannt, denn er hat es selbst gesagt. Im erwähnten Brief an Hieronymus wies er darauf hin, daß den Wert feindlicher Kritik derjenige "scharfsinnig erkannt hat, der gesagt hat, Feinde, die schimpfen, seien meistens nützlicher als Freunde, die Angst haben zu schimpfen".[10] Der *Ciceronianus* Hieronymus,[11] an dessen hohes intellektuelles Niveau sich Augustinus mit dieser gelehrten Anspielung gemäß der epistolographischen Regel der *accommodatio* anpaßte, wußte natürlich, wer gemeint war: Der dies gesagt hat, war Cato der Ältere, der römische Politiker und Zensor im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Gelesen hat Augustinus dieses Diktum Catos bei Cicero, der in seinem Dialog über die Freundschaft, dem "Laelius", der Ansicht Catos zustimmte, "daß um manche Menschen erbitterte Feinde sich mehr verdient machten als die Freunde, die immer nur angenehm erscheinen wollen; jene sagten oft Wahres, diese nie".[12] Wie vieles andere, was Augustinus von der alten römischen Kultur- und Geisteswelt wußte, hat er die Ansicht, ein schimpfender Feind sei wegen seiner oft wahren Kritik nützlicher als ein immer 'netter' Freund, aus Cicero entlehnt. Diese quellenkritischen Zusammenhänge sind längst erkannt: Maurice Testard hat sie in seinem zweibändigen Werk "Saint Augustin et Cicéron" von 1958 aufgezeigt.[13]

Mit dem Verweis auf Cicero respektive Cato befinden wir uns allerdings nicht an der ursprünglichen Quelle des Topos vom Nutzen feindlicher Kritik. Sosehr die Maxime, schimpfende Feinde seien nützlicher als schmeichelnde Freunde, zum gestrengen Zensor Cato passen mochte, der Vater

dieses Gedankens ist er nicht gewesen. Nach Ausweis der Überlieferung—soweit diese uns noch zugänglich ist—stammt er aus der griechischen Philosophie. Über seine genaue Herkunft herrscht zwar keine Einigkeit, doch deuten die diversen Angaben doch in eine bestimmte Richtung.

In einer Spruchsammlung, dem nach dem Aufbewahrungsort der Handschrift (Codex Vaticanus Graecus 743) benannten "Gnomologium Vaticanum", stehen folgende Sentenzen:[14] Zaleucus, dem legendären Gesetzgeber von Lokroi im griechisch besiedelten Süditalien, wird der Ausspruch zugeschrieben, frei von Fehlern (ἀναμάρτητος) werde man durch viele Feinde, weil man aus Angst vor ihrer kritischen Aufmerksamkeit sich bereits von vornherein anstrenge, nur selten einen Fehler zu machen.[15] Nach einer anderen Sentenz soll es Platon gewesen sein, der zur Vermeidung oder Beseitigung eigener Fehler Feinde für nützlicher erklärt habe als Freunde, da Feinde offen Kritik übten, während Freunde aus Scheu vor Kritik eher zur Verschlimmerung von Fehlern beitrügen.[16] Diese Zuschreibung mochte sich vielleicht auf eine Notiz Platons in den "Gesetzen" stützen, der Liebende sei gegenüber dem, was er liebt, blind.[17] Zur Zuschreibung an Platon würde in etwa auch folgende Notiz zu Sokrates in der wohl im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. verfaßten Philosophiegeschichte des Diogenes Laertius passen: "Er vertrat auch die Meinung, man müsse sich den Komikern recht geflissentlich preisgeben"—Sokrates wurde bekanntlich von Aristophanes verspottet—; "denn wenn sie auf wirklich uns anhaftende Fehler hinweisen, so werden sie dadurch auf unsere Besserung hinwirken; wo nicht, so geht uns die Sache nichts an."[18] Wie dem auch sein mag, verläßlich sind diese Angaben nicht. In der Antike war man bei solchen Zuschreibungen nicht an einer historisch korrekten Adresse interessiert, sondern daran, einer mehr oder weniger populären Maxime durch einen berühmten Namen Autorität zu verleihen. Die legendären Gesetzgeber Griechenlands oder berühmte Philosophen waren bei diesem Verfahren, neben den Sieben Weisen, generell beliebte Adressaten.[19]

Wertvoller sind die Angaben, die Plutarch machte. In dem eingangs erwähnten Traktat zur Frage, wie man von Feinden Nutzen haben könne, zitierte er folgenden Spruch des Sokratesschülers Antisthenes: "Wer gerettet werden wolle, brauche aufrichtige Freunde oder leidenschaftliche Feinde; jene hielten durch ihre Mahnungen, diese durch ihre Schmähungen von Fehlern ab."[20] An zwei anderen Stellen in anderen Traktaten hat er dieselbe Sentenz in ganz ähnlichem Wortlaut Diogenes von Sinope in den Mund gelegt.[21] Die Zuweisung an Antisthenes wird gestützt durch eine entsprechende Notiz in der Philosophiegeschichte des Diogenes Laertius:

"Auf die Feinde müsse man achten, denn unsere Fehler bemerken sie als erste."[22] Damit hat sich Plutarch zwar selbst widersprochen, doch ob nun Antisthenes oder Diogenes von Sinope als Urheber dieser Maxime bezeichnet wird, ein Kyniker war es nach dieser Tradition in beiden Fällen.

Bedenkt man den Inhalt dieser Maxime zur nützlichen Kritik von seiten eines Freundes wie von seiten eines Feindes, hat die These, ihre Herkunft im Kynismus zu suchen, manches für sich. Die Kyniker, und zwar Diogenes mehr noch als Antisthenes, waren schon in der Antike bekannt für ihren regelrecht schrankenlosen Freimut (παρρησία), mit dem sie Freund wie Feind wahllos und nach Belieben kritisierten. So soll Diogenes auf die Frage, was das Schönste unter Menschen sei, geantwortet haben: Freimut.[23] Plutarch erwähnte den geradezu sprichwörtlichen kynischen Freimut (παρρησία κυνική),[24] Lukian ließ Diogenes sagen: "Prophet der Wahrheit und des Freimuts will ich sein",[25] und neben mehreren anderen Kritikern eines entarteten Kynismus lehnten Cicero, Horaz und Seneca die oft hemmungslose Kritiksucht der Kyniker ab.[26] Ein in diesem Zusammenhang sehr interessantes Zeugnis hat Themistius, der konstantinopolitanische Rhetor und Philosoph im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr., hinterlassen. In einer lediglich syrisch erhaltenen Rede über die Tugend definierte er die Aufgabe des Philosophen gegenüber einem Feind in Analogie zum bissigen Verhalten des Diogenes, der bekanntlich den Beinamen 'der Hund' trug. Es sei die Pflicht des Philosophen, meinte Themistius, "dass er durch Ermahnung ihn (nämlich den Feind) in Ordnung bringe und heile und, wie durch Bisse, durch Ermahnung verborgene Fehler hervorziehe und ans Licht bringe".[27] In der modernen Forschung gibt es sogar die These, diese Bewertung des Freimuts und sein rhetorischer Einsatz besonders durch Diogenes seien das Spezifikum, das die Kyniker von allen anderen Philosophenschulen der Antike signifikant unterscheide.[28] Zur kynischen Hochschätzung des Freimuts gegenüber jedermann in Theorie und Praxis paßt die Ansicht, Kritik von seiten eines Feindes sei genau so nützlich (oder sogar nützlicher) wie die von seiten eines Freundes, der Sache nach bestens. Entweder also ist diese Maxime tatsächlich von Kynikern kreiert worden, wie Plutarch und Diogenes Laertius berichten, oder die kynische Einstellung gegenüber kritischer Offenheit hat diese Zuschreibung—nicht zu Unrecht—provoziert. Sowohl ihrem Gehalt nach als auch gestützt auf die Aussagen des Plutarch und des Diogenes Laertius kann man daher diese Maxime als kynisch bezeichnen.

Der Nutzen feindlicher Kritik—pagan (Plutarch)

Plutarch ist, soviel ich sehe, der einzige gewesen, der die kynische Ansicht, Kritik vom Feind sei nützlich, nicht nur erwähnt, sondern auch näher erläutert hat. Von Plutarch erfahren wir also, in welchem Sinn dieser Topos in der paganen Antike verstanden worden ist. Den zentralen Gedanken zur Beschreibung ihres positiven Effekts lieferte ihm das Stichwort "Rettung", "Hilfe" (σωτηρία, σῴζεσθαι) in der Antisthenes bzw. Diogenes zugeschriebenen Sentenz: Kritik von seiten eines Feindes wie von seiten eines Freundes sei, wenn sie berechtigt ist, eine Hilfe, eigene Irrtümer und Fehler zu korrigieren, zu beseitigen oder zu vermeiden. Auch das findet einen Anhalt in dem, was von der kynischen Einstellung zu kritischem Freimut sonst bekannt ist. Nach einem von Johannes Stobaeus überlieferten Spruch soll Diogenes 'der Hund' gesagt haben: "Die anderen Hunde beißen ihre Feinde, ich aber meine Freunde, um sie zu retten (ἵνα σώσω)."[29] Freimütiges Äußern von Kritik galt den Kynikern generell als wichtigste pädagogische Methode, mit der sie ihre Mitmenschen von Fehlern befreien wollten.[30] In der von Plutarch referierten Sentenz haben sie diesen Sinn von Freimut auch der von einem Feind geäußerten Kritik beigelegt. Plutarch hat diese Ansicht übernommen und noch weiter erklärt, in welcher Weise der Kritisierte solche Kritik für sich fruchtbar machen könne: Feindliche Kritik könne grundsätzlich als Ansporn zur moralischen Besserung des eigenen Lebens dienen. Der Kritisierte solle dabei nicht auf die—gewiß destruktive—Absicht des Kritikers achten, sondern auf den möglichen Wahrheitsgehalt der Kritik. Auf diesem Wege könne mancher Fehler, den man bisher noch gar nicht wahrgenommen oder vernachlässigt habe, ausgemerzt werden.[31] Der Nutzen feindlicher Kritik bestand für Plutarch also darin, im Falle ihrer sachlichen Berechtigung der eigenen moralischen Besserung förderlich zu sein.

Der Nutzen feindlicher Kritik—christlich (Johannes Chrysostomus)

Die Aufdeckung dieser Zusammenhänge vermag die oben genannten Augustinustexte besser zu erhellen. Der Bischof von Hippo kannte den Topos vom Nutzen feindlicher Kritik aus Cicero, doch in der Sache hat er damit einer kynischen Maxime das Wort geredet. Man darf annehmen, daß er sich dessen nicht bewußt gewesen ist. Es gibt aber einen Text bei einem anderen Kirchenvater, Johannes Chrysostomus, bei dem es sich damit wohl anders verhält. Aufgrund der Ausbildung des Chrysostomus—

er war Schüler des klassisch höchst gebildeten Rhetors Libanius in Antiochien—darf man auf eine große Vertrautheit mit der Tradition der paganen Philosophie und Bildung schließen, in der diese kynische Maxime beheimatet war. Liest man den fraglichen Text, ist der Eindruck, daß Chrysostomus darin vielleicht sogar unmittelbar aus Plutarch geschöpft hat, nicht von der Hand zu weisen, auch wenn das natürlich nicht zu beweisen ist. Maximen wie die vom Feindesnutzen gehörten zum Fundus des allgemeinen Bildungsgutes und konnten einem Gebildeten wie Chrysostomus aus einer beliebigen Quelle zugeflossen sein. Eine Stütze erhält die Vermutung, er kenne sie aus Plutarch, allerdings darin, daß Plutarchs Traktat zum Nutzen eines Feindes neben einer Reihe anderer Abhandlungen seiner "Moralia" im 6./7. Jahrhundert ins Syrische übersetzt worden ist.[32] Dieser Text war also auf christlicher Seite bekannt, und das in einer Gegend (Syrien), zu der man in Antiochien engste Kontakte hatte. Der oben wiedergegebene Spruch des Antisthenes zum Nutzen feindlicher Kritik aus diesem Traktat des Plutarch wird noch in der christlichen Sentenzensammlung der "Loci Communes" aus byzantinischer Zeit, die fälschlich Maximus Confessor zugeschrieben ist, im Kapitel "Über das Mahnen" (περὶ νουθεσίας) zitiert, in das etliche Stellen aus Plutarchs "Moralia" aufgenommen worden sind.[33]

Der fragliche Chrysostomustext also: In einer Predigt über David und Saul, der letzten von drei diesen alttestamentlichen Gestalten gewidmeten Homilien, ging Chrysostomus in einem Exkurs ausgiebig auf den Nutzen ein, den feindliche Kritik einbringen könne.[34] Deutlicher und ausgeprägter noch als in den vorgestellten marginalen Notizen des Augustinus zu diesem Topos tauchen darin die aus Plutarch bekannten Grundgedanken auf: Feinde, die uns berechtigterweise kritisierten, nützten uns mehr als Freunde, die uns lobten und schmeichelten, wenn wir nur zur Akzeptanz solcher Kritik bereit seien. Weil Feinde oft genauer hinschauten, als wir unsere Fehler aus Selbstsucht selber wahrzunehmen gewillt seien, zwängen sie uns zur Korrektur unserer Fehler. Wenn wir daher Fehler aufgrund ihrer Kritik nicht nur erkennten, sondern auch ausmerzten, sei solche Kritik sehr nützlich.

Ob Chrysostomus hier tatsächlich auf Plutarch rekurrierte, wie die inhaltliche Fassung dieser Stelle nahelegt, hat er selber nirgends zu erkennen gegeben. Im Gegenteil: Er hat den Ursprung dieser Gedanken in eine ganz andere Quelle zu verlegen gesucht, nämlich in die Bibel. Während Augustinus im genannten Brief an den klassisch gebildeten Hieronymus, dem er nichts vormachen konnte, die Herkunft dieser Maxime aus der paganen Geisteswelt

unmißverständlich andeutete, hat der Prediger Chrysostomus seiner antiochenischen Gemeinde den paganen Ursprung seiner Ausführungen nicht nur verschwiegen, sondern statt dessen versucht, eine biblische Fundierung seiner Erörterungen beizubringen. Der Einfall, den er dazu hatte, mutet freilich famos an. So einfach war dieses Bemühen ja nicht. Vom Feindesnutzen aus an Feindesliebe zu denken, mag ein christlich naheliegender Gedanke sein, doch ist der Sinn der kynischen Maxime doch anders gelagert als das, was christliche Feindesliebe meint. Auf diesem Weg, an den man denken könnte, wäre Chrysostomus also nicht weitergekommen. Er hat ihn auch nicht beschritten. Auf der Suche nach einer Bibelstelle, in der jemand Kritik von einem Feind zu seinem Nutzen akzeptiert, fiel ihm aber das Gleichnis von Pharisäer und Zöllner ein (Lk. 18,9-14). Mit einer guten Portion Imaginationskraft stellte er sich den Ablauf der Handlung folgendermaßen vor: Obwohl der Zöllner nach Auskunft des Bibeltextes weit weg (μακρόθεν) vom Pharisäer stand und obwohl dieser für sich (πρὸς ἑαυτόν) betete: "Gott, ich danke dir, daß ich nicht wie die anderen Menschen bin, die Räuber, Betrüger, Ehebrecher oder auch wie dieser Zöllner dort" (Lk. 18,11), habe der Zöllner diese Beschimpfung doch gehört, aber nicht zurückgelästert, sondern seine Sündigkeit bekannt: "Gott, sei mir Sünder gnädig!" (Lk. 18,13). Im Rahmen der so vorgestellten Szenerie signalisierte dieses Bekenntnis in den Augen des Chrysostomus die Akzeptanz der Kritik des Pharisäers, die er als in der Sache zutreffend voraussetzte, durch den Zöllner. Angestoßen von der Aussage des Gleichnisses, der Zöllner sei als Gerechter (δεδικαιωμένος) nach Hause gegangen (Lk. 18,14), malte Chrysostomus seinen Zuhörern den Effekt eines solchen Verhaltens rhetorisch gekonnt aus: "Die Anklage gegen seine Sünde wurde zum Erlaß seiner Sünde, der Feind erwies sich ungewollt als Wohltäter." Abschließend sah der Antiochener den Nutzen feindlicher Kritik darin, daß der, der sie als sachlich berechtigt akzeptiere, dadurch von jeder Sünde frei werden könne. Mit diesen Erläuterungen hat Chrysostomus dem kynischen Gedanken ein christliches Kleid anzuziehen versucht, das nur noch für diejenigen durchsichtig war, die mit der zugehörigen paganen Tradition eng genug vertraut waren.

Der Nutzen feindlicher Kritik—ein Thema antiker Seelenleitung und Paränese

Nimmt man die verstreuten Nachrichten aus der paganen wie aus der christlichen Antike zu dieser kynischen Maxime vom Nutzen feindlicher Kritik zusammen, werden ihr Profil und ihr geistesgeschichtlicher Kontext

deutlich. Im Gedanken selbst kann man drei Abstufungen unterscheiden: 1. Kritik vom Feind wird abgelehnt aufgrund ihrer (meist) bösartigen Absicht. Das darf man als die eher übliche, weil menschliche Reaktion auf feindliche Kritik ansehen. 2. Kritik vom Feind wird wie Kritik vom Freund als nützlich für den Kritisierten akzeptiert, wenn sie in der Sache berechtigt ist. Dieser Haltung gelingt es, vom in der Regel polemischen Stil und von der böswilligen Intention solcher Kritik zugunsten der darin möglicherweise enthaltenen Wahrheit abzusehen. 3. Feinde seien bisweilen sogar nützlicher als Freunde, nämlich dann, wenn sie offener und schonungsloser unsere Fehler ans Tageslicht brächten, als Freunde dies aus falscher Zurückhaltung gewöhnlich täten. Diese Ansicht bedeutet die schon von der antiken Philosophie geleistete und von Christen übernommene Aufhebung des archaisch-vulgären ethischen Paradigmas, Feinde seien schädlich, Freunde nützlich, oder umgekehrt: Den Freunden müsse man nützen, den Feinden schaden.[35] Diese bei Kynikern, bei Cato und Cicero, bei Plutarch, bei Johannes Chrysostomus und bei Augustinus begegnende Version zeugt von einer bemerkenswerten Distanz zu sich selbst, aus der heraus man lieber nützliche Scheltworte als schädliche Schmeichelrede zu hören gewillt ist. Daß diese Haltung relativ selten anzutreffen ist, liegt in der Natur der Sache.

Geistesgeschichtlich ordnet sich diese Maxime vom Nutzen feindlicher Kritik in einen breiten Strom antiker Seelenleitung und Paränese ein, in der eine lange Reihe unterschiedlichster Regeln und Direktiven entworfen wurde, die als Hilfestellung zu einer in moralischer Hinsicht besseren Lebensführung gedacht waren.[36] Die Kyniker rechtfertigten ihren Freimut gerade mit dem Hinweis, durch schonungslose Offenheit dem Kritisierten "Rettung" und "Hilfe" bringen zu wollen. Dieser Sinn wurde auch der Anweisung beigelegt, sachlich berechtigte Kritik auch dann zu akzeptieren, wenn sie von einem Feind vorgebracht wurde. Ignoriere man die Person des Kritikers und den womöglich aggressiv-polemischen Stil solcher Kritik, dann lasse sich die destruktive Absicht des Kritikers in einen positiven Effekt für den Kritisierten umkehren. Ein Heide wie Plutarch beschrieb diesen Gewinn als Hilfe auf dem Weg moralischer Vervollkommnung, ein Christ wie Chrysostomus sprach dafür von Sündenvergebung und Rechtfertigung. Den Gehalt dieser kynischen Maxime tangieren solche unterschiedliche Vokabeln trotz der darin sich ausdrückenden religiös-weltanschaulichen Differenzen nicht: In der paganen wie in der christlichen Antike ging es um die noble und anspruchsvolle Bereitschaft, in allem eine mögliche Hilfe für das eigene Streben nach Besserung und Vervollkommnung zu suchen—auch in Kritik von seiten eines Feindes.

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] Aristophanes, *Av.* 375-377. 382. Dazu die Hinweise bei: *Aristophanes, Birds.* Edited with introduction and commentary by N. Dunbar (Oxford 1995) 279f.

[2] Plutarch, *Mor.* 6: Πῶς ἄν τις ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν ὠφελοῖτο (*De capienda ex inimicis utilitate*).

[3] Photius, *Bibl.* 167,113 b 1f. = Stobaeus 2,41 (p. 2,259,5-7 Wachsmuth): Περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἔστιν ἀπ' ἐχθρῶν ὠφεληθῆναι.

[4] Ovid, *Met.* 4,428: *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* Dazu die Hinweise bei: *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen Buch IV-V.* Kommentar von F. Bömer (Heidelberg 1976) 143.

[5] Abaelard, *Epist.* 8 (PL 178,284); Petrus Venerabilis, *Epist.* 4,21 (PL 189,349); Petrus Blesensis, *Epist.* 91 (PL 207,286). Diese Stellen sind notiert bei: R. Häußler (Hg.), *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer* (Darmstadt 1968) 172.

[6] Augustinus, *De trin.* 2,1 (CChr.SL 50,81,24-28).

[7] Ebd. 2,16 (CChr.SL 50,101,53-55).

[8] Augustinus, *Epist.* 73,4 (CSEL 34/2,267,13-16).

[9] Augustinus, *Conf.* 9,18 (CChr.SL 27,144,57f.).

[10] Augustinus, *Epist.* 73,4 (CSEL 34/2,267,11-13).

[11] So nannte sich Hieronymus selber: *Epist.* 22,30 (CSEL 54,190,12).

[12] Cicero, *Lael.* 90.

[13] Zur Abhängigkeit von Augustinus, *Epist.* 73,4 von Cicero, *Lael.* 90: M. Testard, *Saint Augustin et Cicéron*, 2 Bde. (Paris 1958) Bd. 1,246 (ferner: Bd. 1,200. 260. 297. 299; Bd. 2,90).

[14] Gnomologium Vaticanum e codice Vaticano Graeco 743 edidit L. Sternbach, *Wiener Studien* 9 (1887) 175-206; 10 (1888) 1-49. 211-260; 11 (1889) 43-64. 192-242 (Nachdruck: Texte und Kommentare 2, Berlin 1963), wo zu den hier genannten Stellen jeweils noch etliche weitere Hinweise verzeichnet sind.

[15] *Gnom. Vat.* Nr. 305 Sternbach.

[16] Ebd. Nr. 424.

[17] Platon, *Leg.* 5,731 e 5f.

[18] Diogenes Laertius 2,36. Die wiedergegebene deutsche Übersetzung stammt aus: *Diogenes Laertius, Leben und Meinungen berühmter Philosophen.* Übersetzt und erläutert von O. Apelt (Hamburg ^{3}1990).

[19] Für die Sieben Weisen sind Beispiele dafür zu finden bei: *Leben und Meinungen der Sieben Weisen.* Griechische und lateinische Quellen erläutert und übertragen von B. Snell (München ^{4}1971) 100-113.

[20] Plutarch, *Mor.* 6,89B.

[21] Ebd. 4,74C; 5,82AB.

[22] Diogenes Laertius 6,12.

[23] Ebd. 6,69.

[24] Plutarch, *Mor.* 4,69C.

[25] Lukian, *Vit. auct.* 8.

[26] Cicero, *De off.* 1,128; Horaz, *Epist.* 1,18,5-8.15-20; Seneca, *Epist.* 29,1-3.

[27] Die deutsche Übersetzung stammt von J. Gildemeister: Themistios Περὶ ἀρετῆς. Bearbeitet von J. Gildemeister und F. Bücheler, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 27 (1872) 438-462, hier 459.

[28] R.B. Branham, Diogenes' Rhetoric and the *Invention* of Cynicism, in: M.-O. Goulet-

Cazé—R. Goulet (Hg.), *Le cynisme ancien et ses prolongements. Actes du colloque international du CNRS (Paris, 22-25 juillet 1991)* (Paris 1993) 445-473.

[29] Stobaeus 3,13,44 (p. 3,462,17f. Hense).

[30] An einem konkreten historischen Beispiel hat das dargestellt J.L. Moles, "Honestius quam ambitiosius"? An Exploration of the Cynic's Attitude to Moral Corruption in his Fellow Men, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 103 (1983) 103-123 (mit einer wohl vollständigen Liste von einschlägigen Belegen ebd. Anm. 73).

[31] Plutarch, *Mor.* 6,89C.

[32] K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart [2]1964) 138. 168.

[33] Pseudo-Maximus Confessor, *Loc.com.* 16,24 in der Ausgabe von M.B. Phillips, *Loci communes of Maximus the Confessor: Vaticanus Graecus 739 (Greek Text)* (Diss. Saint Louis 1977) 307.

[34] Johannes Chrysostomus, *Hom. de Dav. et Saul.* 3,4 (PG 54,700f.). Dieser Text ist notiert bei: L.F. Pizzolato, *L'idea di amicizia nel mondo antico classico e cristiano* (Turin 1993) 278.

[35] D.A. Hester, To help one's friends and harm one's enemies, *Antichthon* 11 (1977) 22-41; M.Wh. Blundell, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies. A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge 1989; erweiterte Fassung ihrer Dissertation, Berkeley 1984).

[36] Näheres dazu ist zu finden bei: P. Rabbow, *Seelenführung. Methodik der Exerzitien in der Antike* (München 1954); I. Hadot, *Seneca und die griechisch-römische Tradition der Seelenleitung* (Berlin 1969); P. Hadot, *Exercices spirituels et philosophie antique* (Paris [3]1993).

Universität Regensburg, Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät
D-93040 *Regensburg*

REAKTIONEN AUF DAS CHRISTENTUM IN DEN *METAMORPHOSEN* DES APULEUS

VON

VICTOR SCHMIDT*

Es hat den Anschein, daß es in den *Metamorphosen*[1] des Apuleius mindestens eine Stelle gibt, die die übliche ablehnende Meinung der Heiden über die Christen zum Ausdruck bringt, und zwar *Met.* 9,14, wo von der bösen Bäckersfrau die Rede ist. Der Passus lautet: *nec enim vel unum vitium nequissimae illi feminae deerat, sed omnia prorsus ut in qua<n>dam caenosam latrinam in eius animum flagitia confluxerant: saeva scaeva vir[i]osa ebriosa pervivax pertinax, in rapinis turpibus avara, in sumptibus foedis profusa, inimica fidei, hostis pudicitiae. tunc spretis atque calcatis divinis numinibus in vicem certae religionis mentita sacrilega praesumptione dei, quem praedicaret unicum, confictis observationibus vacuis fallens omnis homines et miserum maritum decipiens matutino mero et continuo stupro corpus manciparat* (213,13-23).[2] Mit dem *deus unicus*, zu dem sie sich bekennt, kann nur der Gott der Christen oder der Juden gemeint sein. Weil aber in *c.* 14 die üblichen Anschuldigungen gegen die Christen erwähnt werden, die Apuleius aus der literarischen Tradition bekannt waren (Tacitus, Plinius: *flagitium,*[3] *latrina,*[4] Betrunkenheit schon am Vormittag: *matutino mero*, Sittenlosigkeit) scheint mir jedenfalls dadurch die Sache entschieden zu sein.[5] Ich hoffe in diesem Aufsatz noch zusätzliche Argumente für die These, es werde von dieser Frau die Karikatur einer Christin gegeben, anführen zu können.

Das Bekenntnis der Frau zu diesem exklusiven Gott geschieht *mentita sacrilega praesumptione* (9,14: 213,20). *Praesumptio* erscheint in den *Met.* auch bei der Beschreibung eines Priesters der *Dea Syria*, der sich selber züchtigt: *mire contra plagarum dolores praesumptione munitus* (8,28: 199,17). *GCA* 1985, 248 f. *ad loc.* weist darauf hin, daß Apuleius der erste Autor ist, bei dem *praesumptio* in peiorativem Sinn benutzt wird: "a preconceived incorrect opinion, to which one sticks stubbornly," und zwar, wie auch in 9,14 in einem religiösen Kontext. Auch hier gilt, daß es in dieser Bedeutung zum ersten Mal bei Apuleius bezeugt ist[6] und daß es sich dann nach ihm bei christlichen Autoren findet. So verwendet es Tertullian in *Nat.* 1,17,1 *de*

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

obstinationibus . . . vel praesumptionibus (sc. *nostris*) wo es die Bezeichnung ist, mit der die *pagani* christliche Anschauungen abqualifizieren; auch *Apol.* 49,1 *haec sunt, quae in nobis solis praesumptiones vocantur, in philosophis . . . summae scientiae et insignia ingenia* ist für uns wichtig; mit "Wahnideen" übersetzt C. Becker es in seiner Ausgabe München ^{2}1961 und das ist auch die Bedeuting in *Met.* 9,14. Tertullian verwendet es aber auch, wenn es sich um Häretiker handelt (siehe *ThLL* s.v. 970,6): *Marc.* 4,6,2 *si Marcionis praesumptionem* (sc. *sententiae quaedam*) *percusserint* (postea: *vitio haereticae caecitatis*); *Val.* 4,4 *si aliquid novi adstruxerint* (sc. Valentiani), *revelationem statim appellant praesumptionem.*[7] Und um das Ganze zu vervollständigen: *praesumptio* (oder in diesem Fall das Verb) kann auch von Christen gegen die Heiden verwendet werden: Tert. *Apol.* 13,1 ihr, *pagani, qui quos* (sc. deos) *praesumitis, neglegitis.* Es ist offensichtlich ein Wort, das im religiösen Streitgespräch verwendet wurde, um den Standpunkt des Gegners von vornherein als unhaltbar zu bezeichnen. Das Wort gehört zum gemeinsamen Idiom, dessen sich sowohl Häretiker als auch Christen bedienen, aber auch der Isisadept benutzt es, als er die verächtlichen Priester der Dea Syria bezeichnen will, wie wir zu *Met.* 8,28 beobachten konnten. Wichtig ist dabei auch festzustellen, daß Apuleius für diese spezielle Verwendung des Wortes für uns der erste Zeuge ist. Der Erzähler in *Met.* 9,14 legt durch den Gebrauch von *praesumptio* dieselbe Geringschätzung gegenüber der Religion der Bäckersfrau wie gegenüber der Religion des Priesters der Dea Syria an den Tag.[8]

Dieselbe Geringschätzung zeigt sich in dem Ausdruck *confictis observationibus vacuis* (213,21), denn auch *confictis* wird in *Met.* 8,28 (199,10) in der Wendung *conficto mendacio* verwendet um die Verlogenheit des Priesters der Dea Syria anzuzeigen,[9] also im selben Kapitel, in dem wir *praesumptio* begegnen. Ebenso ist *observationibus vacuis* mit einer ähnlich negativen Konnotation verbunden. *ThLL* s.v. *observatio* 199,60 erwähnt die Kombination noch einmal, und zwar—das ist auch nicht verwunderlich—bei Tert. *Orat.* 15,1 *quoniam unum aliquod attigimus vacuae observationis*, wo es sich um das Waschen der Hände vor dem Gebet, ohne daß es dafür eine Notwendigkeit gäbe, wie das in bestimmten christlichen Kreisen offenbar üblich war, handelt (c. 13). Im nächsten Kapitel wird dann das Waschen des ganzen Leibes, das die Juden praktizierten, getadelt. Für die Kombination *confictis observationibus vacuis* gilt also, daß sie aus lauter Wörtern besteht, die in theologischen Disputen mit dem Zweck verwendet werden, den Gegner als Irrlehrer anzuprangern.

Praesumptio und *confingere* sind nicht die einzigen Worte, die sowohl im Zusammenhang mit dem Priester der Dea Syria als auch mit der Bäckersfrau

verwendet werden. Weitere Berührungspunkte in der Beschreibung des Priesters (oder der Priester) der Dea Syria und der Bäckersfrau sind folgende:
a) Sie ist *in rapinis turpibus avara* (9,14: 213,17); das entspricht der Aussage über die Priester: *omnem illam depraedabantur regionem* (8,29: 200,10) und *astu captioso conraserant non parvas pecunias* (9,8: 209,1).
b) Die Frau ist *hostis pudicitiae* (213,18) und ergibt sich *continuo stupro* (213,23). Die Priester stellen ihre *inlicita libido* zur Schau. *Extrema flagitia* sind es, während die Frau *omnia flagitia* in sich vereinigt (213,15).
c) Die Frau übernimmt sich im Trinken, und bereitet *cenas saliares* (9,22: 219,23) als Vorbereitung zum *stuprum*; die Priester richten *gaudiales dapes* (8,29: 200,12) als Vorbereitung für ihre sexuellen Ausschweifungen an.

Nun wird in den *Met.* der für verachtenswert erklärte Kult der Dea Syria und ihrer Priester von dem Erzähler bis in Einzelheiten hinein dem reinen Isiskult und seinen Gläubigen gegenübergestellt.[10] Die Frage drängt sich auf, ob sich eine ähnliche Konfrontation auch feststellen läßt, wenn es um Isiskult und Christentum geht. Die Frage wurde schon im Jahre 1968 von Walsh[11] aufgeworfen und positiv beantwortet. Wie er behauptet, ist Apuleius' Isisbuch als Reaktion auf die rasche Ausbreitung des Christentums in Africa geschrieben und habe die Isisideologie eine wirksame Alternative zum Christentum gebildet. Wir möchten diesen Weg weiter verfolgen und herauszufinden versuchen, ob es deutliche Hinweise darauf gibt, daß der Erzähler den Isiskult als Alternative zum Christentum anbietet.

Wir wollen dazu die Aussage über die Bäckersfrau, sie bekenne sich zu einem Gott, *quem praedicaret unicum* (9,14: 213,20), etwas genauer betrachten.

Beginnen wir mit *praedicare.* Dieses Verb ist seit Plautus bezeugt, hat aber im christlichen Gebrauch laut Braun "une frappe nouvelle" bekommen.[12] Die Bibelübersetzer verwenden es zur Wiedergabe von κηρύσσειν. Bei Tertullian bekommt das Verb schon eine christliche "physionomie," und es bedeutet unter anderem "eine religiöse Wahrheit verkünden"; "il s'agit de la publication, de la manifestation de vérités doctrinales," so Braun. Aber es ist evident, daß wir für diese Bedeutung nicht christliche Autoren bemühen müssen: Apuleius läßt seinen Erzähler dieses Verb genau in dieser Bedeutung gebrauchen, um den Glauben der Bäckersfrau zu charakterisieren.[13]

Es wird noch interessanter, wenn wir in Tert. *Idol.* 6,2 lesen: *potes lingua negasse quod manu confiteris? verbo destruere quod facto struis? unum Deum praedicare, qui tantos facis?* (das Subjekt ist ein Handwerksmann, der trotz seines Bekenntnisses zum Christentum, heidnische Götzenbilder anfertigt um seinen Unterhalt für sich und seine Familie zu verdienen). Es ist deutlich, daß *unum Deum praedicare* sich der Bedeutung *unum confiteri Deum* annähert, "tournure

si vivante" in der Zeit der Verfolgungen.[14] Man bekommt den Eindruck, Apuleius lasse seinen Erzähler einen christlichen Ausdruck verwenden. Wenn wir auf diesem Weg weitergehen, stellen wir fest, daß *praedicare* im Tert. *Apol.* 18,2 *a primordio in saeculum emisit* (Deus) *spiritu divino inundatos, quo praedicarent Deum unicum esse, qui universa condiderit* genau wie bei Apuleius, *Deum unicum* als Objekt aufweist. Hinzu kommt, daß die Verwendung von *unicus* bei Apuleius auffallend ist. Denn Apuleius ist, soweit ich sehe, in der Latinität der erste Autor, bei dem *unicus* als "theologische" Qualifikation von *deus* gelesen wird.[15] *Deus unicus* fügt sich also in die Reihe der Wörter, die wie *praesumptio* (und *revelare*) zum ersten Mal bei Apuleius, und nachher oft bei christlichen Autoren belegt sind. Tertullian gebraucht, um die Unizität Gottes zu formulieren, entweder *unus* oder *unicus*, wie wir soeben schon sahen. In seiner frühesten Formulierung der *regula fidei* verwendet er noch *unus* (in *Praescr.* 13,2 verstärkt mit *omnino*), in späteren Formulierungen *unicus* (*Virg.* 1,3; *Prax.* 2,1). Zu einer anderen Stelle, in der Tertullian *unicum deum praedicare* schreibt, *Test.* 2,1 *non placemus deum praedicantes* (vergleiche noch *Apol.* 23,11 *unicus quem Christiani profitemur*), macht Braun[16] eine für uns wichtige Bemerkung: "si on rapproche ces dernières indications du passage des *Met.* (9,14 nämlich) d'Apulée où il paraît fort bien y avoir une allusion malveillante au Christianisme . . . et de celui de l'*Octavius* (10,3) où le païen Caecilius se moque du Dieu des Chrétiens (*unde autem vel quis ille aut ubi deus unicus, solitarius, destitutus*)—on remarquera l'ironique commentaire donné à cet *unicus* que Minucius Felix n'emploiera plus dans la suite de l'oeuvre . . .—on peut se demander si la formule . . . n'était pas propre au monothéisme chrétien." Diese Frage möchte ich auf Grund des Vorhergehenden positiv beantworten: Apuleius war die Wortkombination, die als christliches Bekenntnis fungierte, bekannt—wir haben gesehen, daß *praedicare* sich in der Bedeutung derjenigen von *profiteri* annäherte—, und er legte sie der Bäckersfrau in den Mund.

Apuleius war also der erste Autor, bei dem sich *unicus* als theologische Qualification des christlichen Gottes findet. Es gibt aber noch eine zweite Stelle in den *Met.*, an der *unicus* in einer theologischen Bedeutung vorkommt, und zwar in der Selbstoffenbarung der Isis (*Met.* 11,5: 269,12 f.), wo sie sagt: (*ego*) *cuius numen unicum multiformi specie, ritu vario, nomine multiiugo totus veneratur orbis.* Die Wiederholung des "einmaligen" *unicus*, aber diesmal in Verbindung mit *numen*, kann nicht zufällig sein, sondern muß die Entsprechung zu dem *deus unicus* in *Met.* 9,14 sein. Isis ist *numen unicum*, in dem die traditionellen Götter aufgegangen sind: die *deum mater*, Minerva, Venus, Diana usw., die in dem langen Katalog in 11,5 genannt werden.

Der Satz ist konstruiert, wie man das von einem glänzenden Sprachkünstler wie Apuleius erwarten kann: drei ablativi, die variierend die bunte Vielfalt des Isiskults beschreiben: *multiformi, vario, multiiugo*, wodurch der Gegensatz zu *unicum* betont wird. Das wird auch unterstrichen durch die alliterierende Verbindung von *numen* mit *nomen*.[17] Im *numen unicum* der Isis sind die *nomina* der anderen Götter aufgenommen. Isis ist μυριώνυμος, *dea multinominis* (11,22: 284,10). Diese Formuliering "reveals the monotheistic trend in the concept, but with it goes a recognition of other gods subsumed in the godhead."[18] Neben Isis kann das Pantheon weiter bestehen: das Pantheon ist der Ausdruck der allumfassenden göttlichen Macht. Das bildet innerhalb der Worte der Göttin, wie der Erzähler sie wiedergibt—und damit wird der allgemein akzeptierte Standpunkt der *pagani* verkündet—die Antwort auf den exklusiv monotheistischen Anspruch des christlichen Gottes, neben dem für andere Götter, in welcher abgeschwächten Form auch immer, kein Platz ist.

Die oben gestellte Frage, ob in den *Met.* nicht nur eine Konfrontation mit dem Kultus der *Dea Syria*, sondern auch mit dem Christentum zu beobachten ist, werden wir jetzt bejahen können. Denn auch die Stellung, die die Verbindung *dei, quem praedicaret unicum* in 9,14 (213,10) einnimmt, unterstützt diese Interpretation. Unmittelbar vor diesen Worten steht *mentita sacrilega praesumptione*, und es folgt *confictis observationibus vacuis*, lauter Worte, die, wie wir deutlich gemacht zu haben hoffen, im religiösen Streitgespräch gebraucht wurden und zum Teil auch bei der Gegenüberstellung des Kultes der Dea Syria mit dem reinen Isiskult zu lesen waren. Durch die Stellung der Kernworte *dei quem praedicaret unicum* zwischen *mentita sacrilega praesumptione* und *confictis observationibus vacuis*, Wendungen, mit denen der verächtliche Kult der Dea Syria charakterisiert wurde, werden auch diese Kernworte mit einer ähnlichen negativen Konnotation versehen; doch die ablehnende Geringschätzung gilt jetzt nicht dem Kult der Dea Syria, sondern dem Christentum, dem das überlegene *numen unicum* der Isis gegenübergestellt wird.

Auch der Katalog der Götter, die in *Met.* 11,5 als Erscheinungsformen der Isis bezeichnet werden, erhält hierdurch den Charakter einer Konfrontation oder besser Alternative. Denn durch den Katalog wird die "Katholizität" des Isiskults—*totus veneratur orbis*—hervorgehoben. Zu den Verehrern der Isis gehören Phrygier, Cyprioten, Attici, Siculi bis zu den Aithiopes: die damalige οἰκουμένη. In dieser Hinsicht konnte der Isiskult mit dem Christentum, mit dessen Anspruch auf "überall und von jedem, ungeachtet Stand, Geschlecht oder Bildung angenommen" in Konkurrenz treten. Das war mit anderen Worten schon anläßlich der Isisprozession *Met.* 11,10

(273,18) formuliert *turbae sacris divinis initiatae, viri feminaeque omnis dignitatis et omnis aetatis*. Man vergleiche dazu Tert. *Apol.* 1,7 *omnem sexum, aetatem, condicionem, etiam dignitatem transgredi ad hoc nomen* (näml. das Christentum). Schon Plinius *Ep.* 10,96,9 war das im Jahre 106 aufgefallen: *multi* (sc. *Christiani*). ... *omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam*: Stets finden wir genau dieselbe Formulierung!

Wenn wir also davon ausgehen dürfen, das *numen unicum Isidis* sei nur als Alternative zum *deus unicus Christianorum* zu verstehen, liegt es auf der Hand, auch in *Met.* 11,15, in der großen Ansprache des Isispriesters an die Gläubigen, die gerade die Anamorphose des Lucius zum Menschen beobachtet haben, auf einen Hinweis auf die Christen gefaßt zu sein. In seiner Verzückung hat der Priester (*Met.* 11,14:277,2) das Wort ergriffen, um *coram publico* zu erklären, warum Lucius damals in einen Esel verwandelt worden war: *ad serviles delapsus voluptates curiositatis inprosperae sinistrum praemium reportasti* (277,9). Aber jetzt sei Lucius zum *portum quietis* (277,6) und *aram misericordiae*[19] gelangt dank Isis' Gnade, der *Fortuna videns* (277,19). "Komm, Lucius," so fährt er fort, "schließe dich dem Zug der göttlichen Erlöserin an": *videant inreligiosi, videant et errorem suum recognoscant.*[20] Nach Lucius wird eine größere Gruppe, die *inreligiosi*, angesprochen.[21] Und das können m.E. nur diejenigen sein, die das *numen unicum* der göttlichen Erlöserin abweisen, die Christen. Wir werden versuchen unsere These durch eine genaue Uberprüfung der Bedeutung des Wortes *inreligiosus* zu untermauern.

Das diesbezügliche Lemma in *ThLL* liefert einige aufschlußreiche Daten. *Inreligiosus* findet sich, als Bezeichnung von Menschen, zum ersten Mal bei Apuleius.[22] Außer an unserer Stelle lesen wir es auch noch *Apol.* 27,1 *haec ... communi quodam errore imperitorum philosophis obiectantur, ut partim eorum, qui corporum causas meras et simplicis rimantur, inreligiosos putent eoque aiant deos abnuere, ut Anaxagoram et Leucippum et Democritum.* Das Adjektiv bezieht sich dort auf Menschen, die aufgrund philosophischer Erwägungen die Existenz von Göttern leugnen, Atheisten also, die im Altertum immer auf eine geringe Anzahl beschränkt waren. Es ist kaum anzunehmen, daß es sich hierbei um Leute handelt, die einer anderen *religiösen* Ansicht huldigen. Der nächste Autor, bei dem wir dem Wort *inreligiosus* begegnen, ist Tertullian. In *Nat.* 1,17,2 lesen wir: *prima obstinatio est, qua secunda a deis religio constituitur Caesarianae maiestatis, quod inreligiosi dicamur in Caesares, neque imagines eorum repropitiando neque genios deierando*:[23] wir Christen werden *inreligiosi* genannt, weil wir nicht vor den Statuen des Kaisers Opfer darbringen (das lehnen wir hartnäckig ab: *obstinatio*).[24]

Christen sind also *inreligiosi*. Als scharfer Debattierer greift er diese An-

schuldigung der *pagani* auf um zu erklären, in Wahrheit seien sie es, die *inreligiosi* sind: *Nat.* 1,10,20 *quanto inreligiosiores deprehendimini* (ihr, *pagani*), *quam Christiani: privatos enim deos . . . domestica et licentia inculcatis venditando, pignerando.* Ebenso *Apol.* 13,1: *vos* (betont kontrastierend) *e contrario impii et sacrilegi et inreligiosi erga deos vestros deprehendimini, qui quos praesumitis*[25] *esse, neglegitis.* Tertullian praktiziert hier ein Verfahren, das er in *Apol.* 4,1 angekündigt hat: *nec tantum refutabo . . ., sed etiam in ipsos retorquebo, qui obiciunt.* Die Heiden sind *inreligiosi*, weil sie Götter verehren, die eben keine sind, und außerdem sind sie *inreligiosi*, weil sie ihre sogenannten Götter noch obendrein respektlos behandeln. In *Apol.* 24,2 schließlich (*veram religionem veri dei . . . expugnando, in verum committitis* (ihr = *pagani*) *crimen verae inreligiositatis*) wird die *inreligiositas* der Heiden *vera* genannt, was impliziert, daß dem Vorwurf der Heiden, die Christen seien *inreligiosi*, jegliche Grundlage fehlt. Deutlich ist, daß *inreligiosus* das Etikett ist, mit welchem im religiösen Streitgespräch die Überzeugung des Gegners als falsch dargestellt wird. Das wird durch die Tatsache bestätigt, daß dieses Adjektiv auch von Christen in ihrem Kampf gegen die Häretiker verwendet wird. Zwar geschieht das nicht bei Tertullian, jedoch bei Irenaeus, Bischof von Lugdunum seit dem Jahr 177, also sogar noch vor Tertullian.[26]

Fast ein Jahrhundert später finden wir bei Arnobius die gleichen paganen Anschuldigungen gegen die Christen: *Nat.* 1,29 *ergone impiae religionis sumus* (wir, Christen) *apud vos rei et . . . infausti et athei nuncupamur.* Die Christen hängen also einer Religion an, werden aber trotzdem *athei* genannt,[27] weil ihre Religion eine gottlose sei. In 5,30 werden *atheum, inreligiosum, sacrilegum* neben einander genannt: Sie sind offenbar äquivalent, und deshalb sind auch mit *athei*, genau wie *inreligiosi* in Apul. *Apol.* 27,1 prinzipielle Gottesleugner gemeint, vgl. Min. Fel. 8,2 *cui* (Diagorae) *atheon cognomen adposuit antiquitas* (übernommen aus Cic. *Nat.* 1,63, wo ἄθεος zu lesen ist).

Dieses ἄθεος ist auch in der griechischen Welt in den Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Christen und Heiden die geläufige Bezeichnung, siehe Justin 1 *Apol.* 6,1 ἔνθεν δὲ καὶ ἄθεοι κεκλήμεθα · καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου . . . Θεοῦ. Ἄθεος fängt an fast ein Ehrentitel zu werden: Wenn es sich um solche sogenannte Götter handelt, bin ich stolz, ein Atheist zu sein, so Justin. Mit Justin, der im Jahre 165 den Märtyrertod erlitt, sind wir wieder in der Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Wir können noch weiter zurückgehen. Als Polykarp, der circa 156 als Märtyrer starb,[28] während des Prozesses vom Statthalter aufgefordert wird, seinen Glauben zu verleugnen, indem er beim Genius des Kaisers schwört und sagt αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους läßt er seinen Blick über die Scharen

ἀνόμων ἐθνῶν im Stadion schweifen, ballt die Faust, schaut zum Himmel hinauf und sagt: αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους, auf diese Weise die Bezeichnung ἄθεοι auf die Heiden anwendend, gemäß dem Verfahren, das auch Tertullian anwenden wird (siehe oben S. 7). Die Reaktion Polykarps wäre unverständlich gewesen, wenn die Christen damals die Heiden nicht ἄθεοι genannt hätten.[29] Aber ἄθεοι war auch eine ganz geläufige, ja technische Bezeichnung für die Christen geworden und genau wie *inreligiosus* ist es eine Bezeichnung, die konkurrierende Strömungen einander nach Belieben entgegenschleudern konnten. Man meinte damit, wie wir sahen, Leute, die einen Gott/Götter verehrten, der in den eigenen Augen eben kein Gott war. In einem noch etwas älteren Zeugnis lesen wir, daß Ignaz, der circa 117 in Rom den Märtyrertod erlitt, in z.B. *Ep. Trall.* 3 die Heiden mit ἄθεοι bezeichnet. In demselben Brief werden auch christliche Häretiker, die Doketen, so genannt.

Immer klarer stellt sich heraus, daß ἄθεος in theologischen Debatten eine bestimmte Rolle spielte.[30] Daraus dürfen wir folgern, daß *inreligiosus* in bezug auf Menschen zwar zum ersten Mal in der Latinität bei Apuleius bezeugt ist, daß jedoch, wenn mann die Äquivalenz von *inreligiosus* mit ἄθεος bedenkt, die dadurch ausgedrückte Qualifikation schon eine lange Geschichte hinter sich gehabt haben muß. Deshalb können wir auch Tertullian als Zeugen anführen, um die Bedeutung von *inreligiosus* in *Met.* 11,15 genau festzulegen, denn er verwendet *inreligiosus* in der gleichen Weise, wie es schon Generationen vor ihm getan hatten, sowohl christliche wie pagane. Und weil wir aus *numen unicum Isidis* eine implizite Polemik gegen die Christen herauszuhören glauben, hören wir dieselbe Polemik gegen sie in *inreligiosus*,[31] das schon so lange in derselben Polemik als negative Bezeichnung verwendet wurde.

Der Isiskult, der bestrebt war das pagane Pantheon in sich aufzusaugen (siehe oben S. 55), entsprach damit der Tendenz zum Synkretismus, der sich namentlich zur Zeit Mark Aurels immer stärker manifestierte. Die offizielle pagane Hierarchie bemühte sich, die verschiedenen Kulte in die Verehrung des *summus deus* der vielen Namen und/oder des *Sol Invictus* des Sonnenkults einmünden zu lassen.[32] Auch von diesem allgemein paganen "ökumenischen" Gesichtspunkt her, ist es zu begreifen, daß die Christen, die verständlicherweise nicht bereit waren, sich durch diesen Synkretismus vereinnahmen zu lassen, mit *inreligiosi* bezeichnet wurden.

Wir haben gesehen, wie in der Beschreibung der Bäckersfrau in erster Linie der übliche Klatsch und die üble Nachrede über *flagitia* der Christen erwähnt wurden, die in Buch IX bei der Schilderung des Leidensweges des Esels dazu beitragen konnten, die Frau, die den Esel malträtiert, zu

charakterisieren. Es ist bemerkenswert, daß bei den paganen Schriftstellern des 2. Jahrhunderts, die das Christentum nennen, diese Klatschgeschichten verschwunden sind. Plin. *Ep.* 10,96,2 erwähnt zwar die *flagitia cohaerentia nomini* (sc. *Christiano*), spezifiziert sie jedoch nicht, und das *rescriptum* Trajans schweigt darüber. Und tatsächlich redet Plinius in § 7 nur über positive Aktivitäten, die die Christen bei ihrer Vernehmung vorbrächten. Die Kritik an den Christen konzentriert sich auf ihren exklusiven Monotheismus, der die paganen Götter höchstens als Dämonen betrachte und der sie veranlasse, den Kaiserkult abzulehnen. Dieser Aspekt kommt bei der Charakterisierung der Bäckersfrau auch zur Sprache, und auf diese exklusiv monotheistische Auffassung wird u.E. in *Met.* 11,5 reagiert. Daneben richtet sich die Kritik der Heiden auf den in ihren Augen exzessiven Hang der Christen zum Martyrium, ihre *libido moriendi*.[33] Was tatsächlich in den lateinischen Märtyrerakten, angefangen bei denen der Scillitani, Perpetua und Felicitas, aber auch in den griechischen des Polykarp, Justin u.a. ins Auge fällt, ist die Freude, mit der sie den Tod herbeisehnen, den Tag, an dem sie, wie der erste Märtyrer Stephanus, den Himmel geöffnet sehen werden:[34] Ein einziges Beispiel möge hier genügen: Als Polykarp sich weigert seinen Glauben zu verleugnen und der Statthalter ihn zum Scheiterhaufen verurteilt, drängt er auf eine rasche Vollziehung des Urteils ἀλλὰ τί βραδύνεις ... ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἕτερα πλείονα λέγων θάρσους καὶ χαρᾶς ἐνεπίμπλατο (§ 11-12).[35] Wie sehr dies ein *scandalum* für die Heiden war, liegt auf der Hand: der Märtyrertod war für die Christen die Krönung ihrer Opposition gegen den Kaiserkult und dessen, was sie *idolatria* nannten, für sie die schlimmste Sünde.[36] Mit dieser Opposition verband sich selbstverständlich die Opposition gegen das gesamte pagane Pantheon, anders als bei dem Isiskult, der sich dem Kaiser (und folglich Kaiserkult), dem politischen Establishment und damit dem Pantheon gegenüber loyal verhielt, siehe *Met.* 11,17 (279,20): beim Anfang des πλοιαφέσια betet der Priester *principi magno senatuique et equiti totoque Romano populo*.[37]

Wie sehr die *libido moriendi* ein *scandalum* war, geht auch daraus hervor, daß Mark Aurel in τὰ εἰς ἑαυτόν an der einzigen Stelle, an der von Christen die Rede ist, darüber spricht. In 11,3 geht es um die Freiheit, auf Grund seines eigenen Urteils aus dem Leben zu scheiden: οἵα ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ ἕτοιμος, ἐὰν ἤδη ἀπολυθῆναι δέῃ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἤτοι σβεσθῆναι ἢ σκεδασθῆναι, ἢ συμμεῖναι · τὸ δὲ ἕτοιμον τοῦτο, ἵνα ἀπὸ ἰδικῆς κρίσεως ἔρχηται, μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί, ἀλλα λελογισμένως καὶ σεμνῶς καὶ ... ἀτραγῴδως. Die Entscheidung, das eigene Leben zu beenden, muß also laut Mark Aurel auf der richtigen Einsicht beruhen, es müsse eine rationale Entscheidung

sein, nicht, wie bei den Christen, κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν. Es liegt nahe, daß man dabei an die *libido moriendi* der Christen denkt,[38] die sich durch den Widerruf ihres *error* dem Märtyrertod entziehen konnten. In paganen Augen führte ihre ψίλη παράταξις zu einem Freitod, der auf Prahlerei und falsche Einsicht gründe. In den Prozessen gegen die Christen wird ihnen immer wieder von den Behörden nahegelegt, sie sollten sich durch eine einfache Widerrufung ihres *error* einer Verurteilung entziehen. Aber die meisten lehnten das hartnäckig ab. Die Hinzufügung in Mark Aurels Text von ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί erfolgt ohne weiteren Kommentar, fast beiläufig, was darauf deutet, daß jederman wußte, worum es ging.[39] Auch Plinius war diese sture Haltung schon aufgefallen, als er von *pertinacia . . . et inflexibilis obstinatio* der Christen sprach (*Ep.* 10,96,3). *Obstinatio* begegneten wir schon S. 52 an einer Stelle in Tertullian *Nat.*, in der mit *obstinationes* christliche Meinungen qualifiziert wurden. So gehört also auch *obstinatio* in dieselbe Reihe wie *inreligiosus* und *praesumptio*, alles Wörter, die im religiösen Streitgespräch verwendet werden.

In den dreißiger Jahren wurde Fronto als Markus' Erzieher und als Lehrer der Beredsamkeit ernannt. Fronto (±95 – ±167),[40] geboren in Cirta, in Africa, war eine Generation älter als Apuleius; es ist durchaus möglich, daß Apuleius ihm als Landsmann während seines Aufenthaltes in Rom begegnete. Von Fronto ist bekannt, daß er gegen die Christen agierte. Minucius Felix, ebenfalls ein Afrikaner, spricht von einer Rede Frontos gegen das christliche Abendmahl.[41] Auch wenn es Anlaß zu der Vermutung gibt anzunehmen, daß es dabei nicht so sehr um eine *oratio* als solche geht, sondern eher um eine Bemerkung in einer *oratio*,[42] bleibt die Tatsache bestehen, daß Fronto als Vertreter antichristlicher Auffassungen gelten konnte, und daß dabei, in Anbetracht des *convivium incestum* bei Minucius, die Beschuldigung von *flagitia* erneut eine Rolle spielte. Fronto wird seine Auffassung zweifellos seinem Schüler übertragen haben. Dazu kommt noch, daß Marcus' Berater Rusticus, dem er viel verdankte—in 1,7 wird ihm vom Kaiser für seinen positiven Einfluß, wie übrigens auch Fronto in 1,11 gedankt—der Magistrat war, der im Jahr 165 das Todesurteil gegen Justin fällte.[43]

Auch Galen, der mit Mark Aurel befreundet war, spricht in seinen Werken einige Male über die Christen, sogar mit einer gewissen Hochachtung. Ihre *libido moriendi* war auch ihm nicht entgangen, ebensowenig die Leichtigkeit, mit der sie ihren Glauben auf Gleichnisse und Wunder stützten.[44]

Zehn bis fünfzehn Jahre später verfaßt Celsus—vielleicht in Rom—seinen ἀληθῆς λόγος.[45] In der Vorrede legt er dar, wie die Christen den Tod ris-

kierten, und beantwortet die Frage, ob ihre Religion dies Wert sei, negativ. Am Schluß wird ihr sektiererischer Monotheismus verurteilt, während das Buch mit dem Aufruf endet, man möge sich, statt von einem illusorischen Universalismus zu träumen, auf die Seite des Kaisers stellen und sich an der Verwaltung des Reiches beteiligen.[46]

Zum Schluß noch ein Text aus einer unverdächtigen Quelle, in dem die Hauptfigur ein Christ ist, und zwar Lukians περὶ τῆς Περεγρίνου τελευτῆς (= *Peregr.*), über den Kyniker Peregrinus, der im Jahre 165 nach den Spielen in Olympia spektakulär Selbstmord verübte.[47] Vor seinem Selbstmord war Peregrinus eine zeitlang Christ gewesen Ab § 11 erzählt Lukian darüber: ὅτεπερ καὶ τὴν θαυμαστὴν σοφίαν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐξέμαθε (d.h. Peregrinus), nach seinem Studium in Palästina bei Priestern und Schriftgelehrten. Peregrinus wird deshalb verhaftet, und er wird im Gefängnis von seinen Glaubensgenossen großzügig unterstützt: § 13 πεπείκασι γὰρ αὐτοὺς οἱ κακοδαίμονες τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατοι ἔσεσθαι καὶ βιώσεσθαι τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον, παρ' ὃ καὶ καταφρονοῦσι τοῦ θανάτου καὶ ἑκόντες αὐτοὺς ἐπιδιδόασι οἱ πολλοί. Weil sie sich ihrer Unsterblichkeit sicher sind,[48] geben sie sich freudig und freiwillig dem Tod hin ... ἐπειδὰν δε ἅπαξ παραβάντες θεοὺς μὲν τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς ἀπαρνήσωνται. Sie sind also *inreligiosi*[49] und mit ἑκοντες wird auf ihre *libido moriendi* hingedeutet.

Können wir die christliche Phase des Peregrinus präzisieren? Gellius erzählt uns, er sei während seines Aufenthaltes in Athen dem Peregrinus begegnet, und spricht mit Hochachtung über ihn als Philosophen (*NA* 11,11 *virum gravem et constantem*). Er habe ihn oft gehört: *multa hercle eum utiliter et honeste audivimus.*

Auch Apuleius wird in Athen von ihm erfahren haben, wenn wir mit Sandy annehmen, daß Gellius und Apuleius gleichzeitig in Athen Studenten waren und einen gemeinsamen Lehrer hatten.[50] Sandy hält es für das Wahrscheinlichste, daß ihr Studienaufenthalt in Athen in die Jahre 150-155 fällt. Peregrinus' christliche Periode ist also vor Gellius' Aufenthalt in Athen zu datieren. Dieses deutet darauf hin, daß die Christen (und ihre *libido moriendi*) den *pagani* schon vor dem literarischen Niederschlag davon bei Mark Aurel und in den Märtyrerakten bekannt waren; nun können wir Lukian hinzufügen.

Sordi[51] vertritt die Meinung, unter Mark Aurel sei wiederum strenger gegen das Christentum vorgegangen worden, in sofern, als jetzt erneut offiziell nach ihnen gefahndet wurde, und daß nun wahrscheinlich mehrere Probleme den Grund geliefert hätten: die Pest, der Parthenkrieg, der immer größer werdende Druck der Germanen und die wachsende Erkenntnis,

daß das Christentum mit seiner Ablehnung des paganen Pantheons dazu fähig sei das Fundament der Gesellschaft zu unterwandern. Abgesehen von Hinrichtungen—Justin im Jahre 165 in Rom, die Märtyrer von Lyon im Jahre 177, aber auch schon früher (siehe oben S. 57)—wurde auch in literarischer Form, sowohl im Osten als auch im Westen, auf das Christentum reagiert. Mark Aurel fängt an, seine Überlegungen im Jahr 172 niederzuschreiben, Lukian verfaßt seinen *Peregrinus* im Jahre 169 oder 173, Galen circa 180 und Celsus wahrscheinlich auch um diese Zeit;[52] es ist nicht undenkbar, daß er an verschiedenen Stellen in seinem Werk auf Justins Apologien reagiert hat.[53] Dabei geht es dann nicht mehr um Klatschgeschichten über angebliche *flagitia*, sondern um seriöse Bedenken. Labriolle hatte recht, als er schrieb: "à partir de 160 environ la question chrétienne se pose . . . devant tout esprit réfléchi."[54]

Es liegt auf der Hand anzunehmen, Apuleius habe sich als Vertreter der zweiten Sophistik, als Prunk- und Wanderredner, der für seine Leistungen Ehrungen in mehreren Städten bekam, und als *philosophus Platonicus*, wie er selbst sich bezeichnete, mit diesen "esprits réfléchis," die in ihren Schriften im Geiste Mark Aurels und somit der führenden Schichten des Imperiums auf das Christentum reagierten, verbunden gefühlt. Er wird die Möglichkeit, die der Eselsroman ihm bot, ablehnend auf das Christentum zu reagieren, gern genützt haben.

Wir haben bis jetzt eine Reaktion auf den exklusiven christlichen Monotheismus feststellen können: den *inreligiosi* wurde der Isiskult als Alternative angeboten. Gegenüber dem exklusiven Monotheismus der Christen wurde das *numen unicum* der Isis gestellt: man kann, so scheint der Erzähler zu sagen, seine henotheistische Auffassung über die Gottheit auch im Isiskult bestätigt finden, ohne das pagane Pantheon, das das *numen unicum* Isidis in sich absorbiert hatte, zu leugnen oder die Beschuldigung von *inreligiositas* zu befürchten. Wir haben auch gesehen, wie im Isiskult der Anspruch auf Katholizität verwirklicht wurde.[55]

Es ist denkbar, daß auch auf das *scandalum* der *libido moriendi* in den *Met.* eine Reaktion zu finden ist. Diese *libido moriendi* konnte in paganen Augen mit Selbstmord gleichgesetzt werden, wie z.B. deutlich aus einer Bemerkung eines römischen Magistraten hervorgeht, die wir lesen bei Tert. *Scap.* 5 *Arrius Antoninus* (Proconsul in Asia im Jahre 183) *in Asia cum persequeretur instanter, omnes illius civitatis christiani ante tribunalia eius se manu facta obtulerunt. Tum ille, paucis duci iussis, reliquis ait:* ὦ δεῖλοι, εἰ ἐθέλετε ἀποθνῄσκειν, κρημνοὺς ἢ βρόχους ἔχετε.[56] Sich in eine Schlucht stürzen oder sich erhängen sind die üblichen Methoden, deren sich Selbstmörder bedienen. Nun gibt in

Met. 11,21 (283,6 f.) der Priester dem Lucius eine Exegese seiner bevorstehenden Einweihung: *et inferum claustra et salutis tutelam in deae manu posita ipsamque traditionem ad instar voluntariae mortis et precariae salutis celebrari. Mors voluntaria* ist zwar eine gängige Verbindung,[57] wäre aber für die Beschreibung eines mystischen Erlebnisses in der lateinischen Literatur sehr auffallend. Der Priester fügt bei *mors voluntaria* aber *ad instar* hinzu: So wird die Schroffheit des Ausdrucks gemildert, gleichzeitig aber die Verbindung mit der christlichen *libido moriendi* hergestellt.[58] Auch jetzt wird, wie bei *numen unicum*, der Isiskult als Alternative angeboten: man kann, so scheint der Priester zu sagen, seine *libido moriendi* auch im Isiskult praktizieren, ohne dabei mit den römischen Behörden in Konflikt zu geraten.

Und schließlich: die Wunder, die die Gottheit wirkt, sind die sichtbaren Äußerungen seiner Allmacht und dienen folglich als Propaganda für seinen Kult.[59] Wir begegnen dem in den Evangelien, in denen die Wundertaten Jesu den entscheidenden Faktor bei der Bekehrung bilden.[60] Dasselbe lesen wir in der Apostelgeschichte, und wir hören es über gnostische Wundertäter wie Simon Magus oder *pagani* wie Apollonius von Tyana. Tertullian erklärt *Apol.* 21,31 sogar, daß auch pagane Götter durch ihre Wunder Gläubige gewinnen: *quibusdam signis et miraculis et oraculis fidem divinitatis operatur* (sc. die falsche Methode der Dämonen). Auch in diesem Bereich standen die verschiedenen religiösen Strömungen miteinander in Konkurrenz: je größer das Wunder, desto größer die Möglichkeit, andere für seine Sache zu gewinnen; vgl. z.B. die Konfrontation des Petrus und Simon Magus in *Acta Petri* 8-29.[61] Das trifft auch für den Isiskult zu, weil das von Isis bewirkte Wunder, beschrieben in Apuleius' *Met.*, alle bisher bekannten Mirakel übertrifft. Denn bei allen Wundern, die zur Bekehrung zu welchem Gott auch immer geführt haben, wird es nicht leicht sein eine Anamorphose eines Esels in einen Menschen zu finden.

Als die *religiosi*[62] in *Met.* XI,13 (276,12 f.) diese Anamorphose sehen, reagieren sie mit Anbetung: *religiosi venerantur tam evidentem maximi numinis* (*numen* wie in 11,5: 269,17) *potentiam*—die Anamorphose also, deren Beschreibung kulminiert in *cauda nusquam*!—während die *populi* "nur" staunen.[63] Die *inreligiosi* in *Met.* 11,15 werden aufgefordert, sich wie die *religiosi* in 11,13 zu benehmen, das heißt, sie sollen sich der Allmacht der Göttin beugen und ihren *error* einsehen, der darin bestehe, daß sie die Allmacht des *numen unicum Isidis* nicht anerkannten, sondern einer falschen religiösen Auffassung gehuldigt hätten. Auch *error* ist, wie *inreligiosus, praesumptio* u.a. ein Wort, mit dem miteinander konkurrierende religiöse Strömungen einander angriffen. Christen verwendeten es gegenüber den Häretikern, *pagani*

wie hier gegenüber den Christen und Christen gemäß dem üblichen Verfahren gegenüber den *pagani* (*de errore profanarum religionum*!).[64]

Der Aufruf zur Bekehrung (*errorem suum recognoscant*), ein Aufruf zur μετανοία, ist typisch für eine Missionspredigt.[65] Der Aufruf gilt den *inreligiosi*, den Christen. Es verwundert deshalb nicht, wenn wir einen solchen Aufruf auch in den Märtyrerakten lesen, z.B. *Pass. Polyc.* 9: Polykarp wird aufgefordert: ὄμοσον τὴν Καίσαρος τύχην, μετανοήσον, εἶπον · αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους (vgl. oben S. 58).[66]

Wenn Apuleius sich, wie soeben gesagt, mit den esprits réfléchis seiner Zeit verbunden gefühlt hat, und in seinem Roman auf das Christentum reagiert wurde, liegt es auf der Hand anzunehmen, Apuleius habe die *Metamorphosen* in ungefähr derselben Zeit geschrieben, in der die obengenannten Autoren ihre Werke verfaßt haben. Das heißt, daß wir für die *Metamorphosen* eine spätere Entstehungszeit als bisher von den meisten Forschern, mit Ausnahme von Walsh und Griffiths,[67] angenommen wurde, befürworten möchten.

Das einzige Jahr, das in Apuleius' Biographie feststeht, ist 158/9, das Jahr seines Prozesses, von dem seine Apologie berichtet.[68] Daß weder in dieser Apologie (= *de magia liber*) noch in der Anklage gegen Apuleius irgendwelche Anspielungen auf die *Met.* zu finden sind, halte ich noch immer für ein starkes Argument für die These, die Metamorphosen seien erst nach diesem Prozeß verfaßt worden.[69] Mit einer späten Abfassungszeit, d.h. ungefähr in dem Jahr 180, fügt sich Apuleius in die Reihe der anderen von uns genannten paganen Autoren ein, die in derselben Zeit geschrieben haben und auf das Christentum reagierten. Apuleius verfaßte sein Meisterwerk also etwa in seinem 55. Lebensjahr.[70]

Zum Schluß noch eine Bemerkung. Mit der Feststellung, daß im Eselsroman Reaktionen auf das Christentum zu beobachten sind, können wir uns jedoch nicht begnügen, denn wir müssen uns die Situation im Rahmen der Erzählung, in der die Reaktion auf das Christentum in den *Met.* zu lesen ist, vor Augen halten. Im vorangehenden Text ist immer betont worden, daß es in *Met.* 9,14 der *Erzähler* ist, der berichtet, und daß in *Met.* 11,5 und 15 der *Erzähler* die Worte der sich offenbarenden Isis, bzw. des Isispriesters wiedergibt. Das bedeutet aber nicht automatisch, daß der Autor Apuleius sich mit diesen Aussagen identifiziert und daß diese Aussagen seinen Ansichten entsprechen. Wir sind der Meinung, Apuleius habe die Ablehnung des Christentums zwar mit seinem Erzähler und den esprits réfléchis seiner Zeit geteilt, habe sich aber dadurch nicht automatisch in

Buch XI als Isisadepten dargestellt. Eine Anweisung dafür könnte sein, daß in der ganzen Wiedergabe der Anamorphose und des Verhaltens des Esels kurz davor (*Met.* 11,12, vor allem 275,22-27) ein Element von Ironie, kulminierend in: *cauda nusquam* steckt.

Auch hat man darauf hingewiesen, daß die Deutung des Isispriesters, Neugier wäre der Grund der mißlungenen Metamorphose des Lucius gewesen (*Met.* 11,15: 277,9), in scharfem Gegensatz zur Deutung der Gläubigen im nächsten Kapitel steht[71] und daß wir auch nicht erfahren, was Lucius selbst von seiner Anamorphose hält: er verharrt nämlich in Stillschweigen. Das alles sollte uns vorsichtig machen, die These, die historische *persona* des Autors[72] biete uns ohne weiteres den Isiskult als Alternative an, zu unterschreiben. Man soll auch darauf achten, daß im Grunde der Erzähler auch keine neuen Argumente für die Ablehnung des Christentums beisteuert; wie wir gesehen haben, waren *deus unicus, inreligiositas* und *libido moriendi* die üblichen Themen, auf welche sich die pagane Kritik richtete. Und wenn schließlich die Rückverwandlung eines Esels in einen Menschen der ausschlaggebende Faktor bei der Bekehrung der *inreligiosi* sein soll, bedeutet das eine Ironisierung des Wunders, die es uns schwer macht, zu glauben, die historische *persona* des Autors biete uns ohne weiteres den Isiskult als Alternative an.

ANMERKUNGEN

* Für ihre Anregungen, Anmerkungen und Änderungsvorschläge im Text möchte ich an dieser Stelle den Mitgliedern der Apuleiusarbeitsgruppe der Universität Groningen und vor allem Herrn Prof. Dr N. Holzberg (München) herzlich danken.

[1] Es geht mir in diesem Aufsatz um Reaktionen auf das Christentum in den *Met.*, ablehnende, wie sich zeigen wird. Anspielungen auf das Christentum, die man früher feststellen zu können geglaubt hatte, halten einer genauen Prüfung nicht stand, siehe L. Hermann, *L'âne d'or et le Christianisme, Latomus* 12 (1953) 188-191. Dasselbe gilt für Hermanns eigene Theorie, daß Apuleius ein geheimer Christ gewesen sei (*Latomus* 18, 1959, 110 f.). In *Met.* 7,13 (163,21-164,2) hat man parodierende Anspielungen auf Christus' Einzug in Jeruzalem gesehen, siehe dazu *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius* (im folgendem *GCA*) 1981, 163 und D. Shanzer, *"Asino vectore virgo regia fugiens captivitatem": Apuleius and the Tradition of the Protevangelium Jacobi*, *ZPE* 48 (1990) 221 f. Für die Möglichkeit, Aemilianus, einer der Ankläger im Prozess gegen Apuleius (*Apol.* 56), könnte ein Christ gewesen sein, siehe S. Benko, *Pagan Rome and the early Christians*, Bloomington 1984, 105.

[2] Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* werden zitiert nach der Teubner-Ausgabe von R. Helm, mit Angabe der Seite und Zeile. Für die schwierige textkritische Frage (*virosa* oder *viriosa*), siehe *GCA* 1995, 137 zur Stelle.

[3] Zu den *flagitia* siehe M. Simon, *Apulée et le Christianisme*, in: *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à H.C. Puech*, Paris 1974, 304. Interessant für uns ist seine Bemerkung, daß

die Präzisierung der *flagitia* der Frau in *Met.* 9,14 (213,16-18) Übereinstimmungen mit dem Lasterkatalog in *N.T.* 1 *Cor.* 5,11 aufweise. Es geht zu weit anzunehmen, Apuleius habe den Lasterkatalog vor Augen gehabt, aber es ist nicht auszuschließen, daß ihm ein christliches Pamphlet bekannt war, in dem diese Beschuldigungen gegen *pagani* gerichtet waren. Mit einem Tertullianischen *studium retorquendi* (siehe unter S. 57) hätte Apuleius dann diese Anschuldigungen auf die Christen zurückgelenkt. Ein solches Verfahren kann man öfters konstatieren. Es könnte ein zusätzliches Argument für unsere These erbringen, daß mit der Pistorsfrau nicht eine Jüdin gemeint sei (siehe dazu Simon 304, der außerdem darauf hinweist, daß Celsus in seinem Angriff auf das Christentum die Juden als Verbündete betrachtete: *CC* 1,41; 67; 2,34; 55 usw.).

[4] *Met.* 9,14 (213,15) *omnia prorsus, ut in quandam caenosam latrinam in eius animum flagitia confluxerant* ist zu vergleichen mit Tac. *Ann.* 15,44,4 *per urbem . . . quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda* (gemeint ist *exitabilis superstitio Christianorum*) *confluunt.*

[5] Die Skepsis in dieser Hinsicht der *GCA* IX 380 f., App. IV, teile ich nicht. Den dort genannten Befürwortern dafür, daß es sich um eine "Christin" handelt, kann man noch hinzufügen W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, Oxford 1965, 266 Anm. 125; R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum. Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*, Paris [2]1977, 68 Anm. 2; J. Tatum, *Apuleius and the Golden Ass*, Ithaca—London 1979, Anm. 65; J.K. Krabbe, *The Metamorphoses of Apuleius*, New York 1989, 101; N. Fick-Michel, *Art et mystique dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée*, Paris 1991, 228 f.; C. Schlam, *The Metamorphoses of Apuleius*, London 1992, 8. Zögernd J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Apuleius of Madauros. The Isis-Book* (*EPRO* 39) Leiden 1975, 345 und 359. K. Dowden, *The Roman Audience of the Golden Ass*, in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore-London 1994, 429 verweist auf eine schon von B. Baldwin *LCM* 14, 1989, 55 aufgezeigte kuriose Parallele in Justin 2 *Apol.* 2, wo die Rede von einem unmoralischen Mann in Rom ist, der mit einer Frau, die früher μέθαις χαίρουσα καὶ κακίᾳ πάσῃ war, verheiratet war. Sie war Christin und trennte sich von ihm. Er rächte sich an ihr, indem er sie als Christin denunzierte. In *Met.* 9,29 f. trennt der Mann sich von seiner Frau wegen ihres unmoralischen Benehmens und wird später Opfer ihrer übernatürlichen Rache.

[6] Für dieses Phänomen, siehe auch V. Schmidt, *Moralische Metaphorik bei Apuleius und im christlichen Latein am Beispiel morum squalore*, *WS* 103 (1990) 139-143 und ders., *Revelare und Curiositas bei Apuleius und Tertullian*, *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* (im folgendem *GCN*), vol. VI, Groningen 1995, 127 f. (= Schmidt 1995).

[7] J.C. Fredouille, *Tertullien. Contre les Valentiniens* (Sources Chrétiennes 280,281) Paris 1980-81 verweist auf *Met.* 9,4 (205,15), wo *praesumptio* zwar "opinion fausse" bedeutet, aber nicht in einem religiösen Kontext steht. Tert. *Val.* 4,4 ist für uns auch noch interessant, weil *praesumptio* auf einen—in Tertullians Augen—übertriebenen Gebrauch von *revelationes* zielt. Braun, *op. cit.*, bemerkt zu Tert. *Res.* 31,3, wo es sich um die spezielle Offenbarung handelt, wodurch Ezechiel die Auferstehung Christi "gezeigt" wurde: "venue de Dieu, la *revelatio* désigne le mode surnaturel de la connaissance: des antithèses l'opposent en un emploi absolu à l'*aestimatio* et à la *praesumptio* purement humaines." Vgl. für die Opposition *aestimatio—revelatio* auch J.H. Waszink, *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Anima*, edited with Introduction and Commentary, Amsterdam 1947 zu Tert. *An.* 9,3. Für die Bedeutung von "Offenbarungen" in der Gnostik, siehe z.B. Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels*, London [2]1990, 4850, und für *revelare* in den *Met.* und Tertullian, Schmidt *op. cit.* 1995.

[8] Siehe *GCA* 1985, 287 f. App. IV.

[9] Siehe *GCA* 1985, 291 App. IV.

[10] Siehe *GCA* 1985, 287-298 App. IV.

[11] P.G. Walsh, *Lucius Madaurensis*, *Phoenix* 12 (1968) 154 (wiederholt in der Introduction XXXVIII f. seiner neuen Übersetzung [Oxford 1994]). Soweit ich sehe hat Walshs Theorie wenig Beachtung gefunden. Griffiths *op. cit.* 5 äußert sich zögernd, skeptisch ist F. Solmsen, *Isis among the Greeks and Romans*, Cambridge Mass.-London 1979, 149 Anm. 45. T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study*, Oxford ²1985, 258 findet den Gedanken "alluring," lehnt ihn aber trotzdem ab; C. Schlam, *The Metamorphoses of Apuleius*, London 1992, 129 Anm. 8 und K. Dowden, *The Roman Audience of the Golden Ass*, in: *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, ed. J. Tatum, Baltimore-London 1994, 434 Anm. 32 erwähnen die These, ohne sich weiter damit zu beschäftigen.

[12] Braun, *op. cit.* 430 f.

[13] Auch für die "spezifisch christliche" Bedeutung von *revelare* konnten wir dies feststellen: wir lesen sie ebenfalls schon bei Apuleius, siehe Schmidt, *op. cit.* (Anm. 6).

[14] So Chr. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, Roma ²1961, II 65.

[15] Nicht erwähnt in Forcellini (der nur *Met.* 4,9 *manus unica* nennt), Georges, *OLD*, Blaise, *LS*. In *Iuv.* 8,109 f. *pater armenti capto eripietur agello, ipsi deinde Lares, si quod spectabile signum, si quis in aediculo deus unicus* ("resté seul," so de Labriolle-Villeneuve in der Budé-Ausgabe) hat *unicus* eine völlig andere Bedeutung.

[16] Braun, *op. cit.* 68 Anm. 2. Die Interpunktion des Abschnitts habe ich ein wenig geändert.

[17] *Numen ist* in der Latinität zum ersten Mal bei Accius frg. 646 und 691 (Ribbeck) attestiert. Frg. 646 lautet: *alia hic sanctitudo est, aliud nomen et numen Iovis*. Apuleius' Vorliebe für die archaische Poesie ist bekannt: er hat seine alliterierende Verbindung von *numen* und *nomen* also aus Accius übernommen.

[18] Griffiths, *op. cit.* 144 zu *Met.* 11,5 (269,15) *deorum dearumque facies uniformis* und *GCA* 1985, 293.

[19] Siehe dazu Schmidt 1995, 133.

[20] Ein raffinierter Apuleianischer Satz: Chiasmus der Verben, starke Betonung durch Anaphora von *videant*; das zweite *videant* genau in der Satzmitte; 9 Silben vorangehend (*videant inreligiosi*) und 9 darauf folgend (*errorem suum recognoscant*).

[21] Die Teilnemer an der Prozession bestehen in der Mehrzahl aus Gläubigen, aber bei ihnen haben sich auch interessierte Neugierige angeschlossen. Die Reaktion auf das Wunder der Anamorphose ist denn auch verschieden: *Met.* 11,14 (276,12) *populi mirantur, religiosi venerantur*. Siehe auch 11,16 (279,4) *cuncti populi tam religiosi quam profani*: "populi is the wider term which includes the faithful and the unattached bystanders," so Griffiths, *op. cit.* 236.

[22] Als Adv. findet es sich Tac. *Ann.* 2,50,2, als Neutrum bei Plin. *Ep.* 4,1,5 und 9,35.

[23] *Qua = quatenus*, siehe A. Schneider, *Le premier livre ad nationes de Tertullien*, Neuchâtel 1968, 287, der diesen schwierigen Abschnitt wie folgt übersetzt: "la première accusation de fanatisme, première dans la mesure où le culte consacré à la majesté de César suit immédiatement celui des dieux, résiste en ceci que nous passons pour impies à l'égard des Césars, parce que nous refusons d'adresser un sacrifice propitiatoire à leurs images" etc. Vgl. W. v. Hartel, *Patristische Studien*, *SB Wien* 1890, III 32: "Diese Hartnäckigkeit kommt an erster Stelle oder als die wichtigste in Betracht, insofern auch die Verehrung der Kaiser nach der Verehrung der Götter die erste Stelle einnimmt."

[24] Vergleich noch Tert. *Apol.* 10,1 *deos, inquitis, non colitis et pro imperatoribus sacrificia non penditis.*

[25] Auch *praesumere* gehört zum Vokabular des Streitgesprächs, siehe oben S. 53.

[26] Siehe *ThLL* s.v. 397,17 f.

[27] *Atheus* findet sich übrigens selten in der Latinität: *ThLL* s.v. führt nur fünf Stellen an.

[28] Polykarps *martyrium* fand circa 156 statt, aber eine genaue Datierung ist nicht möglich, siehe H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford 1972, xiii. Eine etwas spätere Datierung bei P. Steinmetz, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Literatur des 2. Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt* (*Palingenesia XVI*), Wiesbaden 1982, 106 Anm. 104: "eher in die Zeit zwischen 165-168 zu datieren," mit weiteren Literaturangaben. Siehe jetzt auch B. Dehandschutter, *The Martyrium Polycarpi: a Century of Research*, in: *ANRW* 27,1 (1993) 497-502, spez. 502: "a date earlier than 177 . . . seems reasonable."

[29] So A. v. Harnack, *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten* (*Texte und Untersuchungen* N.F. XIII, Heft 4), Leipzig 1905, 5 (auch S. 12.).

[30] Ἄθεος ist im *N.T.* ein hapax legomenon. Paulus verwendet es *Ep. Ephes.* 2,12, um den früheren Zustand der jetzt bekehrten Heiden zu beschreiben: ἔλπιδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ, als Beschreibung ihrer Lage, ohne Beiklänge von Vorwurf oder Kritik, siehe v. Harnack, *op. cit.* 3.

[31] Vergl. C. Harrauer, *Kommentar zum Isisbuch des Apuleius*, Diss. (Masch.), Wien 1973, 100 zur Stelle: "Polemik gegen das immer stärker werdende Christentum?"

[32] Siehe M. Sordi, *The Christians and the Roman Empire*, London-Sydney 1983, 75.

[33] Selbstverständlich gab es auch Christen, die in der Stunde der Bewährung ihren Glauben verleugneten und ihrer *libido vivendi* folgten, aber *die* waren für die paganen Betrachter nicht interessant. Es war die *libido moriendi*, die bei den Prozessen Aufsehen, Mißbilligung und Ärgernis erregte und auf Unverständnis stieß. Das war so im Jahre 165 im Fall Justins, aber wir wissen, daß schon vor Justin der *praefectus urbi* Lollius Urbicus Todesurteile gegen Christen vollziehen ließ, siehe Justin 2 Apol. 1-2; siehe auch Dowden *op. cit.* 429 und Anm. 29.

[34] *N.T. Act. Ap.* 7,56 ἰδοὺ θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς διηνοιγμένους καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν ἑστῶτα τοῦ θεοῦ.

[35] Andere Beispiele: von einem gewissen Quintus, der zusammen mit Polykarp verurteilt wurde, heißt es § 4: οὗτος δὲ ἦν ὁ παραβιασάμενος ἑαυτόν τε καί τινας προσελθεῖν ἑκόντας; Just. 4,6 (recensio C) τοῦτο ποθοῦμεν, τοῦτο ζητοῦμεν (d.h. den Martyrertod); die Märtyrer von Lyon 55 χαίρουσα (sc. Blandina) καὶ ἀγαλλιωμένη ἐπὶ τῇ ἐξόδῳ. Speratus (act. Scillitanorum 15) antwortet auf die Ankündigung seiner Exekution: *Deo gratias agimus* (die Märtyrerakten werden zitiert nach der genannten Ausgabe Musurillos). *Pass. Perp.* 6 *procurator* (nos) *damnat ad bestias: et hilares descendimus ad carcerem.* Vor seinem eigenen Martyrium war auch Justin die Todesverachtung der Märtyrer aufgefallen: ὁρῶν (sc. Justin) δὲ ἀφόβους πρὸς θάνατον (die Christen nämlich): 2 *Apol.* 12,1.

[36] Man lese (oder besser: höre) das Trompetengeschmetter, mit dem Tertullian *de idololatria* beginnt: *principale crimen generis humani, summus saeculi reatus, tota causa iudicii idololatria.*

[37] Siehe R.L. Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, London 1988, 428 f. über den Unterschied in der Behandlung von Juden und Christen durch die römische Behörde, und K.A.D. Smelik, *Tussen tolerantie en vervolging, Lampas* 22 (1989) 180 f.

[38] So A.S.L. Farquharson, *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*, Oxford 1944, 859 und W. Theiler in seiner Übersetzung mit Anmerkungen, Zürich ²1979.

[39] Es gibt keinen Grund ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί in Mark Aurels Text für eine Glosse zu hal-

ten, "a marginal exclamation by a pagan reader who lived in a time when the persecutions of the Christians filled a larger part in men's thoughts than I think they did in those of Marcus," so P. Brunt, *Marcus Aurelius and the Christians*, in: *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (ed. C. Deroux), Brussel 1979, 498. Das Christentum war in dieser Zeit ganz gewiß schon ein Thema; zudem paßt κατὰ ψίλην παράταξιν in die pagane Tradition seit Plinius (siehe die soeben genannte Stelle *Ep.* 10,96,3).

[40] Siehe E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome*, Cambridge Mass.-London 1980, 137-142.

[41] Min. Fel. *Octavius* 9,6 *et de convivio notum est, passim omnes locuntur; id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio* (so der Heiden Caecilius); 31,2 *de isto* (sc. *convivio incesto*) *et tuus Fronto non ut adfirmator testimonium fecit, sed convicium ut orator adspersit. Haec enim potius de vestris gentibus nata sunt* wirft der christliche Opponent zurück. Siehe für Fronto's Feindschaft gegen die Christen auch Benko, *op. cit.*, index s.v. Fronto. Fronto's Angriff auf die christliche Eucharistie könnte als Argument verwendet werden, um die These von D. Tripp (*Emer.* 56, 1988, 245-254) zu unterstützen, der in Apul. *Met.* 9,22 (219,23 f.) eine Allusion auf die Eucharistie sieht, aber bewiesen scheint mir Tripps These nicht.

[42] So Champlin, *op. cit.* 86 f.

[43] Für die Datierung, siehe Dowden, *op. cit.* 429 Anm. 29.

[44] Siehe R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians*, Oxford 1949, 43; 57; 68 f. und index s.v. Christians. Für Galens Freundschaft mit Mark Aurel, siehe S. 59.

[45] Ich folge M. Borret in seiner Ausgabe *Origène, Contre Celse V* (*Sources Chrétiennes* 277), Paris 1976. Für den Entstehungsort, siehe S. 137 f.; für die Datierung S. 129; für die übersichtliche Darstellung des Inhalts S. 118 f. Siehe auch H. Chadwick, *Origen: contra Celsum*, Cambridge ²1980, XXVIII: wahrscheinlich geschrieben um 177-180; XIX: in Rom oder Alexandrien.

[46] Sordi *op. cit.* 74 suggerierte sogar die Möglichkeit, Celsus habe sein Werk verfaßt, um die Politik des Kaisers zu unterstützen. Es scheint mir nicht unmöglich, aber einen Beweis dafür gibt es nicht.

[47] Allgemein wird angenommen, daß Lukian dieses Werk kurz nach dem Ereignis verfaßte: im Jahre 169 oder 173. Siehe zuletzt M.D. McLeod, *Lucian. A Selection*, Warminster 1991, 269 f.

[48] Siehe für τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατοι ἔσεσθαι V. Schmidt, *Lukian über die Auferstehung der Toten* (*VC* 49, 1995, 388-392).

[49] In einem späteren Werk (um das Jahr 180) erwähnt Lukian noch einmal nebenbei die Christen: *Alex.* 25 λέγων ἀθέων ἐμπεπλῆσθαι καὶ Χριστιανῶν τὸν Πόντον, verwendet also die übliche Anschuldigung, wiederholt in 38 mit der interessanten Beifügung εἴ τις ἄθεος ἢ Χριστιανὸς ἢ Ἐπικούρειος ἥκει: die Christen jetzt sogar in der Gesellschaft philosophischer Atheisten (siehe oben S. 57).

[50] G.N. Sandy, *West meets East: Western Students in Athens in the Mid-Second Century A.D.*, in: *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel V*, 1993, 163 f.

[51] *Op. cit.* 70 f.

[52] Siehe oben Anm. 46.

[53] So B.P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des II^me^ et III^me^ siècles après J.C.*, Paris 1971, 291; auch Borret, *op. cit.* 191.

[54] P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne*, Paris 1942, 59.

[55] Es ist hier nicht der Ort, auf Aspekte des Isiskults und des Christentums, die Aussenstehenden mindestens vergleichbar scheinen konnten, näher einzugehen. Es genügt hier auf Harrauer *op. cit.* 144, und Griffiths *op. cit.* 281 zu *Met.* 11,21 (283,14-16) zu

verweisen; Griffiths 243 zu 11,15 (277,5); Walsh *op. cit.* 154 und H.S. Versnel, *Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism*, Leiden 1990 (*Studies in Greek and Roman Religion* 6) 90 f. zu *Met.* 11,6 (270,27); R.E. Witt, *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World*, London 1971, 257 zu *Met.* 11,26 (287,20); Harrauer 138 zu *Met.* 11,21 (282,25) *patientia*; Harrauer 105 f. und Griffiths 257 zu *Met.* 11,16 (278,11) *fide.* Siehe auch M. Smith, *Pauline Worship as seen by Pagans, HThR* 73 (1980) 243.

[56] Vgl. Brunt, *op. cit.* 491 f.

[57] *ThLL* s.v. *mors* 1507,36 f. nennt Cic. *Prov.* 6; *Scaur.* 5; *Brut.* 103 *al.*; Liv. 6,1,7; Vell. 2,87,3 *al.*, immer in der Bedeutung "Selbstmord."

[58] Selbstverständlich ist über *ad instar voluntariae mortis* noch viel mehr zu sagen, siehe z.B. die ausführliche Anmerkung in Griffiths' Kommentar zu *Met.* 11,23,14 (285,14) *accessi confinium mortis*; Harrauer zur Stelle und J.C. Fredouille, *Apulée. Metamorphoses. Livre XI.* Paris 1975 ad loc. Daß ein Tod einer Wiedergeburt vorausgehen muß (vgl. die traditionelle Verbindung τελευτᾶν—τελεῖσθαι), wird in den Mysterien, aber auch z.B. *N.T. Rom.* 6,4, oft betont. Aber nirgendwo finde ich den Aspekt der Freiwilligkeit (d.h. eines Selbstmordes) so nachdrücklich erwähnt. Genau dies führt mich zu der Annahme, mit *ad instar voluntariae mortis* wird auf die *libido moriendi* der Christen angespielt.

[59] Siehe A.D. Nock, *Conversion*, Oxford ²1961, 83 f. und 254 f.; Griffiths *op. cit.* 237.

[60] Siehe z.B. R. MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire A.D. 100-400*, New Haven-London 1984, 22 f. und die klare Aussage des Origenes in *C.C.* 1,46,9 οὐκ ἂν γὰρ χωρὶς δυνάμεων καὶ παραδόξων ἐκίνουν (Jesus und die Jünger) τοὺς καινῶν λόγων καὶ καινῶν μαθημάτων ἀκούοντας πρὸς τὸ καταλιπεῖν μὲν τὰ πάτρια παραδέξασθαι δὲ μετὰ κινδύνων τῶν μέχρι θανάτου τὰ τούτων μαθήματα.

[61] MacMullen, *op. cit.* 133, Anm. 8. Die *Acta Petri* sind, wie man annimmt, spätestens verfaßt in der zweiten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Tertullian erwähnt nämlich in *Bapt.* die *Acta Pauli*, die mit den *Acta Petri* bekannt sind.

[62] *Religiosus* als Bezeichnung der Isisadepten findet sich öfters in Buch XI. z.B. 282,2; 287,9 (Lucius selber); 278,5 *agmini religioso*; 284,25 *religiosa cohors.*

[63] Das Staunen ist ein festes Element im Wunderbericht, siehe dazu E. Peterson, εἷς θεός, Göttingen 1926, 193. Wenn er dieses Staunen in christlichen Quellen erwähnt, bemerkt Peterson *loc. cit.*, daß das Christentum die Bezeugung des Staunens in Verbindung mit der Erzählung des göttlichen Wunders schon in der heidnischen Aretalogie vorfand, und nennt dafür als erstes Zeugnis unsere Apuleiusstelle.

[64] Es ist interessant, daß auch in dem schon öfters zitierten Pliniusbrief von *error* die Rede ist: *adfirmabant* (d.h. die Christen, die ihren Glauben unter Druck der Behörden leugneten) . . . *hanc fuisse summam vel culpae vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire* (*Ep.* 10,96,7), obgleich dort das Wort in erster Linie in einer juridischen Bedeutung verwendet wird, siehe dazu Sordi *op. cit.* 62 f.

[65] So Harrauer *op. cit.* 100 zur Stelle. Dieser Aufruf ist auch schon in der ersten christlichen Missionspredigt *N.T. Act.* 2,38 zu lesen.

[66] Auch z.B. *Pass. Apollonii* (verfaßt zwischen 180 und 185, so Musurillo *op. cit.* XXIV) 3 und 7; *Pass. Scillitanorum* 1 *potestis indulgentiam domni nostri imperatoris promereri, si ad bonam mentem redeatis. Redire ad bonam mentem* steht auf einer Linie mit *errorem suum recognoscere* und bedeutet eine Rückkehr zu ihren früheren, vorchristlichen religiösen Überzeugungen.

[67] *Op. cit.* 250 f. und *op. cit.* 8 f. "probably c. 170," etwa in seinem 46. Lebensjahr, wenn wir annehmen, daß er im Jahre 124 geboren ist.

[68] Die letzten Daten in Apuleius' Oeuvre gehen zurück auf etwa das Jahr 170, siehe Griffiths *op. cit.* 13 in Nachfolge von Walsh.

[69] Walsh *op. cit.* etwas vorsichtiger: das Fehlen von Verweisungen auf die *Met.* in der *Apol.* "suggests, but not conclusively," daß der Roman damals noch nicht veröffentlicht war. Siehe auch R. Helm in: *Apuleius. Metamorphosen oder der Goldene Esel* (lateinisch und deutsch) Berlin [6]1970, 34: "frühestens 169-177 geschrieben") und R.Th. van der Paardt, *The Unmasked I, Apuleius Met.* XI 27, *Mnemosyne* 34 (1981), 103-104.

[70] Kürzlich hat Dowden für eine frühe Datierung und für Rom als Entstehungsort plädiert, obgleich er, wie er selbst zugibt, dafür keine unbestreitbaren Argumente geben kann: "my arguments . . . present at the minimum a hypothesis worth entertaining" (*op. cit.* 419). Seine Argumente sind 1) Apuleius' Oeuvre konnte nur überleben, weil es in Rom zirkulierte. Aus der *subscriptio* in F wird klar, daß in den Jahren 395/7 ein Mitglied der höchsten Gesellschaft in Rom und Byzanz Emendationen vorgenommen hat. M.E. ist das kein unleugbarer Beweis für das Entstehen der *Met.* in Rom in der Mitte der fünfziger Jahre; 2) die Abwesenheit von Karthago in den *Met.* Auch das scheint mir kein zwingendes Argument zu sein in einer Erzählung, die in Thessalien situiert ist (zugegeben: die Ereignisse der letzten Zeilen spielen in Rom); 3) unbeweisbar ist Dowdens These dort, wo er S. 426-427 *Apol.* 64 *iste superum et inferum commeator* (ein Wort, das laut *ThLL* s.v. sich nur an den zwei Stellen bei Apuleius findet, abgesehen von einer dubiösen Stelle in *CIL* VIII 22672) mit *Met.* 11,11 (274,19) *ille superum commeator et inferum* vergleicht und meint, das passe besser in den *Met.* ("more systematically motivated"). Dasselbe behauptet Dowden bei *Apol.* 64 *totius rerum naturae causa et ratio et origo initialis* (als Bezeichnung des ersten Prinzips des Universums) in Vergleich mit *Met.* 11,5 (269,12-14) *rerum naturae parens . . . saeculorum progenies initialis* (als Bezeichnung der Isis).

[71] Siehe J.J. Winkler, *Auctor and Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass.* Berkeley 1985, 209 f.

[72] Es ist hier nicht der Ort, die vieldiskutierte Frage des Verhältnisses des Autors zu seinen *personae* zu erörtern. Siehe dafür z.B. van der Paardt, *loc. cit.* 96-104, Winkler, *op. cit. passim*; K. Sallmann, *Irritation als produktionsästhetisches Prinzip in den Metamorphosen des Apuleius, GCN* I (1988), 81 f.; N. Holzberg in seiner für breite Kreise bestimmten Einführung in: *Apuleius, Der goldene Esel*, herausgegeben und übersetzt von E. Brandt und W. Ehlers, München-Zürich [2]1989.

NL-9471 HG *Zuidlaren*, Eltinge 35

JEWISH LITURGICAL TRADITIONS IN EARLY SYRIAC CHRISTIANITY

BY

G. ROUWHORST

Several scholarly publications have noted and drawn attention to the presence of a remarkably large number of Jewish traditions in Syriac Christianity, especially during the first four centuries. It is for example generally agreed upon that the Peshitta contains several elements that must have been drawn from targumic or midrashic traditions.[1] Apart from the Syriac translation of the Old Testament, (traces of) Jewish traditions are also to be found in other areas of Syriac ecclesiastical life, such as biblical exegesis[2], theology[3] and asceticism.[4]

The presence of these Jewish elements deserves particular attention for at least two reasons. First, the history of the first centuries of Christianity can to a certain extent be accounted for as a breakaway movement inside the multiform and variegated world of contemporary Judaism. Seen from this point of view, the fact that in one particular geographical area this process took place in a different way and apparently at a comparatively slower pace than elsewhere cannot but provoke the curiosity of every historian interested in the origins of Christianity particularly in relation to its Jewish roots. However, the fact that a strikingly large number of Jewish traditions have been preserved in early Syriac Christianity, is of interest for still another reason. For nearly a century a debate has been going on about the origins of early Syriac Christianity. Generally speaking, two opinions have been defended in this discussion that until now has not yet led to a general agreement. At least since the appearance of F. Burkitt's "Early Eastern Christianity" (London 1904) a considerable number of scholars have upheld the view that Jews must have played a substantial role in the Christianization of a city like Edessa and more generally in the areas east of Antioch where Syriac was spoken, beside Greek or otherwise. A majority of them even goes so far as to ascribe the foundation of the earliest Christian centres in the Syriac-speaking area to a Jewish Christian mission, directly from Jerusalem or Palestine.[5] On the other hand, there are scholars

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997
Vigiliae Christianae 51, 72-93,

who sketch a totally different picture of the origins and the earliest history of Syriac-speaking Christianity. They assume that the Christian belief reached Mesopotamia and neighbouring areas inside and outside the Roman Empire alongside the main trade routes to the east which passed by the Syrian metropolis Antioch. More or less in conformity with this view they consider the earliest Syriac churches to be deeply influenced by the strongly hellenized Church of Antioch.[6] Now it appears evident that for the outcome of this debate the degree in which early Syriac Christianity has preserved Jewish traditions, is of particular interest. If indeed the number of those traditions—or traces of them—would turn out to be comparatively high, this would provide a strong argument in favour of the theory that Jews played a substantial role in the Christianization of the Syriac area. Moreover, this hypothesis would further gain in probability if those traditions would prove to be old and widespread, in particular if they would appear to date back to the beginnings of Syriac Christianity. Conversely, if the evidence would be otherwise and the number of Jewish traditions would turn out not to be essentially higher than elsewhere, there would be every reason to be sceptical about Burkitt's theory and a more Gentile Christian (Antiochene?) origin of Syriac Christianity would be probable. This would also be the case if the number of Jewish traditions would prove to be relatively high, nevertheless giving the impression to be introduced at a later period or being confined to a limited geographical area.

Among the various types of traditions that are of interest in this connection, those that belong to the area of the *liturgy* merit particular notice, and for the following two reasons. First, without denying the importance of some stimulating and original studies about this issue, it has to be admitted that in comparison with for example the exegesis of the Old Testament in the quest for the origins of Syriac Christianity the liturgy has received relatively little attention. A second reason is that the liturgy is of particular importance because of its communal character. Liturgical rituals are performed, not by individuals but by communities, by groups of believers, even when one must allow for the fact that not all of them participate in a ritual with the same degree of involvement. Moreover, rituals are characterized by a certain stability; usually they are not invented all of a sudden and at least their basic structures are not so easily changed. Therefore liturgical rituals have quite a high representative value. In this respect they differ from ideas and opinions found in the writings of individual authors, such as theologians and exegetes.

Starting from these considerations I want to focus the attention in this

article on the presence, the persistence in one form or another of Jewish liturgical traditions in the Syriac Churches of the first four/five centuries. The question I want to clarify is whether, or rather to what extent those Churches have preserved in their liturgy Jewish ritual traditions or elements of them. And what can be inferred from all this about the origins and the earliest history of Syriac Christianity?

Before entering in detail into these questions, it will be useful to make some preliminary remarks as to the method that will be followed. First, as a matter of fact my concern will not be with those indisputably Jewish traditions present in early Syriac Christianity that are common to all early Christian Churches, such as for example the use of bread and wine in the Eucharist and the rites connected with it, or baptism by immersion. The question is rather to find out whether or not the Syriac Churches have preserved more Jewish liturgical rituals or liturgical elements—and during a longer time—than other Greek or Latin speaking Christian communities. Further, until now I have used quite naïvely the designation "(early) Syriac Christianity." This designation, however, is quite problematic in so far as it is very difficult to demarcate the borders of the Syriac-speaking region because there were large areas, especially more to the West around Antioch, that were neither purely Syriac nor completely Greek, but bilingual. This has implications for the method we will have to follow and particularly for the selection of the sources. We cannot confine ourselves exclusively to documents written in Syriac. Time and again we will have to take into consideration and make use of texts that have been written in Greek but originate from the bilingual region and betray a clear affinity with Syriac sources.

Traces of Jewish Liturgical Traditions

1. *Church Architecture*

For nearly a century archeologist and historians of liturgy have noted a number of peculiarities in the construction and particularly the groundplan of a number of ancient churches—the oldest ones dating from the fourth century—in Mesopotamia, as well as in North Syria.[7] To begin with, the apses of these buildings do not, as usual, contain seats for the clergy. Instead they are filled by the altar that in most other churches of East and West is located further in (the direction of) the nave. Moreover, in the middle of the nave—and this is certainly the most distinctive feature—

one finds an, at first sight, curious structure: a large, walled-in, platform that because of its U-shaped curved wall (near the rear side of the church) forms a sort of counter-apse. This platform is considerably larger than the Byzantine ambos that are likewise situated somewhere in the middle of the church and, for the rest, are also to be found in a number of (West) Syrian Churches. The platform in question differs from these Byzantine/West Syrian ambos in still another respect: in contrast to these lecterns the Mesopotamian/North Syrian type of exedra contains the throne of the bishop and the seats for the rest of the clergy, i.e. precisely the elements one misses in the apses of the Mesopotamian/North Syrian type of church

The explanation of these architectural peculiarities is to be found in a number of literary sources deriving from the area in question. These sources make mention of a "bema" that is situated in the middle of the church and in all respects recalls the raised U-shaped platform of the above-mentioned church buildings. What is, however, more important, is that these writings supply detailed information about the liturgical function fulfilled by the bema. Its function already becomes clear from the earliest reference to the existence of the bema which is to be found in Ephrem's eighth memra on Nicomedia.[8] According to the deacon of Nisibis, the bema that was constructed "in the middle" and is described as a "source in the centre around which the congregation flocks together," was the place where the liturgy of the Word was celebrated, i.e. where the Bible was read, the sermon was held and psalms were sung. This information given by Ephrem, is corroborated by later sources,[9] in particular by a number of Nestorian commentaries on the liturgy, dating from the seventh till the ninth centuries. From these sources it appears that the entire first part of the Eucharist—including the sermon and the psalms—was celebrated on the bema. This implicated that the clergy remained there during the whole liturgy of the Word: it was only after the preparation of the gifts that the bishop or priest and his concelebrants descended to the sanctuary where the altar stood. And this, of course, explains why there were seats on the bema, but not in the apse or somewhere else near the altar.

In this connection now it is important to note that some authors, among others D. Hickley, have suggested that there could be a relationship between the plan of the Mesopotamian/North Syrian Churches and that of the synagogues as they existed in Palestine and the Diaspora.[10] At least from the second/ third century C.E. some synagogues were provided with platforms that were intended for the reading and the explanation of the Scriptures, i.e. the Torah and the Prophets and, what is still more striking, were called

bemas. Is it therefore not very likely, so the scholars in question concluded, that the groundplan of the Syriac churches, and particularly the use of the bema, is derived from the plan of the synagogues?

Against this theory a number of critical objections may be raised. First, it should be remarked that the only old synagogue of the Syriac-speaking area, of which there remains some physical evidence, is that of Doura-Europos. Moreover, contrary to what Hickley believes, there are no clear traces of a bema in this synagogue.[11] As for the numerous synagogues that have been excavated in other areas of the Roman Empire, notably in Galilee, but also in the Diaspora, it has to be stressed that those buildings vary considerably in structure, building plan and interior.[12] What is still more important, among the different buildings excavated there is none of which may be said with certainty that it already at an early period had a disposition identical with or even similar to that of the early Syriac churches.[13] On the contrary, it is striking that, precisely the synagogues which date of the second and the third century, the period in which one would expect the affinity between (large groups of) Syriac Christians and Jews to be the greatest, have plans that are quite different from those of the later Syriac churches.[14] Moreover, it could be rightly remarked that the word bema is of Greek provenance (one of its basic meanings is: raised platform or tribune).[15] On the basis of all this one might object that it is well imaginable that both Syriac Christians and Jews would have borrowed independently from each other the word βῆμα from Greek to indicate the place from which the Bible was read and explained in their liturgy.

Against this objection the following counter-arguments can be adduced. First, the presence of a platform/exedra that is called "bema," that serves exclusively for the liturgy of the Word (in its entirety) is unique in early Christianity and moreover it does not have a counterpart in non-Christian contemporary religious architecture: apart from the Mesopotamian/North Syrian churches it exists only in the Jewish synagogues. Although one cannot rule out beforehand the possibility that both Syriac Christians and Jews independently adopted the same Greek loan word and gave it the same specific liturgical and architectural meaning, this does not seem to be a very likely solution and it certainly does not gain in plausibility when one realizes that the Jewish bemas are almost certainly older than the Christian ones and that the Christians, when they started constructing their bemas, cannot have been completely ignorant of the plan and interior of synagogues. All in all, in one way or another the architecture of the Mesopotamian and North Syrian churches must, maybe more or less unconsciously, have been influenced by that of the synagogue.

2. *The liturgical reading from the Torah and the Prophets*

But what texts were read on the bema (if there was one)? Which parts of the Bible could the Syriac-speaking Christians regularly hear during the liturgy, especially during the first part of the Eucharist?

Here again we note a remarkable parallel with the reading of the Bible in the Synagogue.[16] From several sources it becomes clear that in the Syriac Churches—or at least in a large number of them—the reading from the Bible in the Eucharist included two Old Testament pericopes, the first one being taken from the Pentateuch, the Tora, and the second one from the Prophets, such as was the case in the Synagogue, on the Sabbath and on Tuesdays and Thursdays. This custom is attested to by the Apostolic Constitutions.[17] From the allusions made to the liturgical reading of the Scripture, one can infer that there were usually four lessons, taken successively from a) the Law, i.e. the five books of Moses and most probably the other historical books, b) from the Prophets (among which also the sapiential books seem to have been reckoned), c) from the Acts of the Apostles or the letters of Paul and d) from one of the Gospels (see II,57,5 and compare II,39,6 and VIII,5,11). The information provided by the Apostolic Constitutions remarkably fits in with what can be deduced from several Syriac sources. In the so-called Doctrine of the Apostles, a document that must go back to the fourth century, one can read that the Apostles had constituted that from the bema (!) nothing should be read than the "Old Testament, the Prophets, the Gospel and the Acts of the triumphs of the Apostles."[18] The liturgical reading of the same books—in the same order—is also prescribed by Addai in the famous Doctrine of Addai.[19] Allowance must be made for the fact that the last-mentioned sources do not give explicit details about the number and the order of the lessons that should be read at each liturgical meeting. Nonetheless, the conclusion that the four-lesson-system of the Apostolic Constitutions is presupposed, does not seem too far-fetched. This hypothesis is, at any rate, largely corroborated by what we know about the reading-systems used, at a somewhat later period, in the East and West Syrian liturgies. To begin with the latter, one of the most remarkable features of the West Syrian reading-systems[20] testified to by numerous manuscripts, is their enormous multiformity. What all these systems, however, have in common is a regular reading of two or even more passages from the Old Testament, from the Tora as well as from the other "historical" books, the Prophets and the sapiential books. Still more interesting are the closely related reading systems of the East Syrian ("Nestorian") Churches.[21] These have at every

Eucharist two Old Testament readings, the first of which is taken as a rule from the Pentateuch/Tora and the second from the Prophets.

At first sight one might be inclined to question or at least to minimize the importance of these facts. First, one might object that there do not exist precise parallels between the Jewish reading systems on the one hand and the Syriac ones on the other and that the Syriac Christians appear to have selected their Old Testament lessons more or less independently from already existing Jewish traditions. Second, the Old Testament, the Tora as well as the Prophets, were part of the canon accepted by the Syriac Churches. One might, therefore, ask whether it was not very natural for them to read regularly from the Old Testament writings during the liturgy. Is it really necessary to appeal here to influences from the Synagogue?

Against these objections two counter-arguments may be advanced. First, it should be emphasized that the above-mentioned sources make a clear distinction between the Tora/Law and the Prophets. This unmistakably recalls the liturgical practice of the Synagogue. Further, it may be remarked that the regular reading from both the Tora and the Prophets in the Eucharist is something unique in the Early Church. Apart from the Syriac Churches and the Apostolic Constitutions there is no evidence that points to the existence of such a practice elsewhere in early Christianity. In fact, regarding the liturgical reading of the Old Testament there appear to have existed in the Early Church two traditions.[22] First, a large number of Churches had during the Eucharist but one lesson taken from the Old Testament and preferably from the Prophets (this in a certain contrast with the reading systems of the Synagogue that has as its most striking feature a continuous reading of the five books of the Tora). Probably this was the practice followed in the church of Justin[23] and it is, at any event, attested by authors such as John Chrysostom[24] and Ambrose.[25] Another practice is to be found in Jerusalem[26] and, probably already at an early period, in Rome.[27] In the churches of these cities there was no regular reading from the Old Testament during the Eucharist at all. As a rule, only two pericopes were provided and apart from a number of exceptions, both were taken from the New Testament. Needless to say, that seen in this light the practice of the Syriac Churches is very remarkable and calls for an explanation.

3. *The Eucharistic Prayer*

It is not only in the first part of the Eucharist that the Syriac-speaking Christians of the first centuries have preserved some elements of the Jewish liturgy. The second part of the Mass, as it must have been celebrated by these Christians, equally bears a striking resemblance to Jewish ritual traditions that hardly can be coincidental and is best explained by Jewish influences upon Syriac Christianity.

In this regard special mention has to be made of the famous anaphora of Addai and Mari (AM).[28] This eucharistic prayer, used by the Nestorian and Chaldean Christians, up to the present day, is here of particular interest for two reasons. First, it was originally composed in Syriac and not translated from the Greek, as is the case for a large number of other "Syriac" anaphoras. Second, this text has a "twin" that is used in the Maronite rite and is there attributed to Peter, but also, in earlier manuscripts, to the Twelve Apostles and that is commonly known (from its opening word) as Sharar.[29] Through a comparison of the two anaphoras, it becomes possible to reconstruct a very old common core that must go back at least till the time prior to the separation of the Maronites and the Nestorians, i.e. the Council of Ephesus (431), but most probably it is still older and was composed during the fourth or even the third century, before the great Christological controversies broke out.[30]

The anaphora thus reconstructed shows a structure that on the one hand deviates on some points from those peculiar to other eucharistic prayers dating from the fourth and the fifth century and on the other hand bears a very striking similarity with the pattern of the birkat ha-mazon, the thanksgiving said after meals as it must have been known at te beginning of the Common Era. As a matter of fact, the common core of AM and Sharar contains the following elements: an opening dialogue that is followed by a glorification of the Name of the triune God as the Creator and Saviour; the Sanctus preceded by an introduction; a thanksgiving for redemption by Christ; a prayer of intercession; an epiclesis; a final doxology.[31] When one compares this prayer with other more or less contemporary anaphoras, one misses at least two elements: the Institution Narrative and moreover an explicit anamnesis in remembrance of the death and resurrection that forms a natural sequel to the Institution Narrative.[32] On the other hand, it is striking that when examined more closely, the pristine form of AM proves to consist of three parts—each concluded by a doxology—that can be characterized as a glorification (the first part till the

Sanctus), a thanksgiving and a supplication (the intercession and the epiclesis). AM has this tripartite structure in common with the Jewish meal-blessing called the Birkat ha-mazon, as it globally speaking must have existed at the beginning of the Common Era.[33] In effect, the Birkat ha-mazon in use at that time consisted of three berakoth giving three themes—blessing for food and creation (Birkat ha-zan); giving thanks for the land and redemption (Birkat ha-aretz) and supplication for the people and Jerusalem (Birkat yerushalayim). Apart from this tripartite structure, AM and the birkat ha-mazon have some remarkable details in common.[34] To begin with the first word of the birkat ha-aretz is: "nodeh" which can best be translated as "we give thanks." This form now corresponds exactly to the main verb used in the first sentence of the Syriac thanksgiving which is derived from the same stem and has the same meaning as the Hebrew word). Likewise, there is a similarity between the third part of AM and the Birkat Yerusalayim. It should, first of all, be remarked that both texts are petition prayers. Furthermore, the petition of AM contains an intercession for the "upright and just fathers," i.e. the deceased, among which are reckoned the prophets and the apostles, but also all the baptized Christians. This intercession has a remarkable parallel in the so-called Ya'aleh we ya-vo, an embolism that on big Jewish festivals is inserted in the Birkat Yerushalayim and in which God is asked to remember the "remembrance of our fathers."[35]

4. *Traces of the Jewish sabbath*

One of the most characteristic features of the Jewish liturgy is the weekly celebration of the Sabbath, both at home and in the Synagogue. The question therefore naturally arises whether this day has not influenced the liturgical traditions of Syriac Christians as well.

There is no doubt that as far as the majority of the Syriac Churches is concerned, the answer must be negative. In fact, most of the known Syriac sources do not bear any evidence of the continuing influence of the Sabbath or even of elements related to it. If they make mention of the weekly Jewish day of rest at all, it is only in a polemical sense and particularly with the intention to restrain Christians from observing that day.[36] This fact in itself, of course, demonstrates that some Christians felt attracted by the Sabbath or rituals connected with it and celebrated it together with the Jews or, what seems more probable, had developed their own Christian Sabbath practices. This does, however, not alter the fact that the relevant sources in question themselves are opposed to any celebration of the Sabbath.

There is, however, one source deriving from the area concerned, that adopts a totally different, much more positive attitude towards the Sabbath, viz. the Apostolic Constitutions (AC). In this document, the fervent polemics against the Jewish day of rest so characteristic of other early Syriac writings are completely absent. On the contrary, it is striking that those parts of the Apostolic Constitutions (books 1-6), which notoriously constitute an adapted version of the Syriac Didascalia, have left out the passages of the latter source that contain polemics against the observance of the Sabbath! Moreover, Christians are even explicitly called on to observe not only the Sunday, but also the Saturday which is considered as the day on which the creation of the world is commemorated (VII,23,2; VII,36,1.5 and VIII,33,2). On both days they are supposed to assemble together for a liturgical service (II,59,3) and, what must seem more surprising, to rest, viz. to abstain from work (VII,36,1.5 and VIII,33,2), whereas it is forbidden to fast on these days (VIII,47,64). The most surprising and noteworthy fact in this regard, however, is the presence in the seventh book of a series of six prayers that appear to be nothing but a (strongly) Christianized version of the Amidah of the Sabbath (that instead of the usual eighteen, contains only seventeen blessings). As already had been noted by olders authors such as K. Kohler,[37] W. Bousset[38] and E. Goodenough[39] and as recently has been confirmed by a penetrating monography by D. Fiensy,[40] the six prayers of AC correspond in content with the first six Sabbath blessings.[41] Even the order of the Christian blessings is the same as that of the Jewish ones: for example, the Qedushah appears both in the Jewish and in the Christian prayer before the third blessing. Very remarkable is also the fact that the blessing of the Sabbath has been inserted in AC, albeit in a heavily adapted version (see further).

These facts should be seen in the right perspective. The Apostolic Constitutions are not the only source dating from the end of the fourth century to allot a particular place to the celebration of the Saturday. Liturgical services on that day are testified to by several sources describing liturgical practices in the East during the same period.[42] As far as I know, however, there are no indications that during that period elsewhere Christians abstained from work on Saturday and certainly there are no other examples known of Christianized Sabbath blessings.

5. *The Christian Passover*

The weekly celebration of the Saturday/Sabbath is not the only moment of the liturgical year in which the Churches belonging to the Syriac-speaking area and its vicinity have preserved for a long time traces of Jewish liturgical

traditions. These are also to be found in what certainly was the most important and, prior to the fourth century, only annual festival, viz. Easter, the Christian version of Jewish Passover.

As I have argued in other publications,[43] there are strong indications that the Syriac churches till the Council of Nicea were Quartodecimans and that they celebrated Easter on the Jewish date, in the night from the fourteenth to the fifteenth Nisan, just as the Christians of Asia still did in the second century. First of all, the writings that Ephrem the Syrian and Aphrahat,[44] the most prominent Syriac authors of the fourth century, have devoted to the celebration of Easter, betray a conception of the theological content and meaning of this festival, which on the one hand differs considerably from that found in contemporary Greek and Latin writings, but on the other hand immediately recalls the famous Quartodeciman Easter homily of Melito of Sardis[45] as well as the (probably) likewise quartodeciman, Easter sermon that usually is designated as that of Pseudo-Hippolytus.[46] The most striking feature that the Easter texts of Ephrem and Aphrahat have in common with the above-mentioned Quartodeciman texts, is a very strong emphasis on the Passion and Death of the Lord, as well as on his descent into the Underworld, whereas the resurrection of Christ and the scene of the empty tomb clearly play a less important role. In the second place, an analysis of the 21st chapter of the Syriac Didascalia,[47] a document originally written in Greek, but originating from the same bilingual area as the Apostolic Constitutions, has led me to the conclusion—otherwise already having been suggested by other scholars—that this text contains an old stratum, revised and adapted by several redactors of the fourth century, which reaches back to the third century and presupposes a Quartodeciman Easter practice.

If all this holds true and if, indeed, the Syriac-speaking Christians were Quartodecimans till the beginning of the fourth century, the conclusion must be that their Easter celebration retained for a remarkably long time some Jewish elements. First, there is the fact that the Jewish date was kept for such a long time. Further, it should be noted that the specific Easter theology of Aphrahat and Ephrem, as well as that of Melito and Pseudo-Hippolytus, with its emphasis on the Passion and Death of Christ rather than on his Resurrection, can be best viewed as the result of a typological explanation of the events that are described in the book of Exodus and are at the centre of the Jewish Passover, the slaughtering of the Passover Lamb and the liberation of the Jewish people from Egypt.

In Search of an Historical Explanation

Now that the most important traces of Jewish liturgical traditions in the Syriac churches have been summed up, the question remains how these should be accounted for. How to explain the fact that the Syriac-speaking churches in their liturgies have preserved more Jewish liturgical elements than other Christian communities did at the same period?

In order to answer this question, it is first necessary to go deeper into a point to which until now we have not paid explicit attention. We need to know more exactly *when* the Jewish traditions came into the Syriac Churches?

In this connection it is of great interest to realize that not all the Jewish liturgical traditions mentioned thus far, can have entered Syriac Christianity at the same period. The information that we can infer from the relevant sources about these traditions and especially about their antiquity, urges us to generally distinguish two types, those that harken back very far in the history of Syriac Christianity, most probably to the period of its emergence, and those that must have been introduced at a later period.

A liturgical practice that certainly belongs to the first category, is the custom of celebrating Easter on the Jewish date. This appears already from the mere fact of its wide geographical diffusion (from the "Western" area where the Didascalia originated all the way to the far-off Persian Empire where Aphrahat lived). For the rest, it is completely unlikely that the Quartodeciman practice was introduced into Syriac Christianity at a later period for still another reason: from the second half of the second century this practice became extremely controversial[48] and it is simply impossible that the Syriac churches would have adopted it after that period and certainly not on such a large scale, unless one wants to believe that these churches lived in complete isolation from the rest of the Christian world, which is however completely out of the question. Next, the custom of regularly reading from the Tora and the Prophets during the Eucharist, seems to have very ancient roots as well. At least one has to admit that no serious arguments can be adduced against its antiquity and that, on the contrary, the wide diffusion of this practice which is found in the Apostolic Constitutions as well as in sources related to Edessa, argues rather in favour of its origin at a very early period.[49] Finally, there is nothing to indicate that the anaphora of AM would represent an idiosyncratic curiosum inside Syriac-speaking Christianity. If it therefore has preserved a number of Jewish elements and bears a striking similarity with the birkat ha-mazon,

it is very likely that it reflects in this respect a widespread and old tradition. This all the more so, because we know on the basis of non-Syriac sources, such as the Didache and Eucharistic prayers derived from other Christian traditions,[50] that the Eucharistic prayer has indeed its oldest roots in Jewish prayer traditions, particularly in that of the birkat ha-mazon and that AM for that reason makes an archaic impression.

As to the Jewish traditions that must have been introduced into the Syriac Churches at a somewhat later period, to this category belongs at any rate the use of the bema during the Liturgy of the Word. As a matter of fact, at least till the end of the third century, Christians celebrated their liturgy in house-churches, viz. edifices that may have been already exclusively used for specific church functions, but still had the form of houses and did not have a bema comparable to those found in the later Syriac churches. Further, the celebration of the Saturday/Sabbath appears only in one source, that is moreover relatively late, whereas several other sources which are, in addition, older, explicitly condemn it. This means that the antiquity of this tradition, as far as the majority of the Syriac Churches is concerned, is very unlikely.

The antiquity of the liturgical traditions under discussion being more precisely determined, the basic question still remains unanswered: how to explain the presence of such a large number of Jewish liturgical elements in Syriac Christianity? For what reasons did these elements enter the Syriac-speaking Churches east of Antioch?

To begin with the oldest traditions which seem to have their origins in the formative period of Syriac Christianity, that is to say in the first or second century, it has to be admitted that the relevant sources as such hardly contain direct—and reliable—information about their original background. On the other hand, given the fact that the liturgical traditions in question reach back to a very early period, the number of solutions that merit serious consideration, is very limited. In fact, I can imagine only two plausible explanations for the existence of the Jewish liturgical elements in early Syriac Christianity: a) The Syriac Christians—or at least a great number among them—wanted to remain faithful to the oldest ritual traditions they had received from the first missionaries. Eventually their conservative attitude may have been occasioned or reinforced by a certain—though of course not a total—isolation from the rest of the Christian world, which, in turn, might be accounted for among others by their use of the Syriac language. b) These Christians were more acquainted and familiar with

Jewish liturgical traditions than those living in other areas and moreover, unlike the latter, they attached a particular importance to the maintenance of a number of these traditions (that is to say in the Christianized form in which they practised them). In that case, it is very likely that the earliest Syriac-speaking Churches comprised a considerable number of Christians who were of Jewish descent. As a matter of fact, these two explanations are not in contradiction with each other and maybe the most plausible solution is to be found in a combination of these.

The introduction of the two Jewish traditions which were adopted at a later date, may be accounted for as follows. As to the use of the bema, the most plausible explanation for its adoption is that the Syriac Christians, when they needed buildings for their liturgy that were adapted to larger groups of believers and a richer ritual, drew their inspiration partly and probably more or less unconsciously from the liturgical disposition of the synagogues with which they were familiar and that probably to them seemed more practical and suitable than any other type of edifice they knew.

About the custom of celebrating Saturday as a kind of Sabbath, as it is supposed by the Apostolic Constitutions, something more can be said. In fact, relevant indications concerning the background and the origin of this intriguing practice are to be drawn from the Christianized Sabbath benedictions which are included in AC and which are undoubtedly connected with it.

As for these prayers, several scholars have argued that it is very unlikely that the author/compiler of AC with his definitely anti-Jewish bias, borrowed these texts directly from the Synagogue.[51] It is much more plausible that he obtained these texts from an intermediary written or oral Christian source that itself reflects the liturgical practice of a group of Christians that was open to influences from the Synagogue and used slightly Christianized Jewish prayers. In this respect it is interesting to note that recently the suggestion has been made that the prayers in question originated from Jewish-Christian circles.[52] In my view this solution deserves serious consideration, first of all because it is a very natural one, but also because the text of one of the blessings found in AC points in the same direction and may be adduced as an argument in favour of this presumption. In fact, the third of these prayers, the one that is explicitly devoted to the theme of the Sabbath, follows a somewhat surprising train of thought. On the one hand, the Sabbath is paid a high tribute in a way that may be called surprising in a Christian writing. On the other hand, it is conspicuous that

the text of the prayer emphasizes the superiority of the Sunday vis-à-vis the Saturday/Sabbath. "The Sabbath," so we read, "is the rest from creation, the completing of the world, the seeking after laws and the thankful praise to God for the gifts he has given to men. *The Lord's day (however) surpasses all this, as it points to the Mediator himself, the provider, the lawgiver, the cause of the resurrection, the first-born of the whole creation, God the word and man begotten of Mary alone, without the intervention of a man, who lived a holy life, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and rose from the dead, manifesting the resurrection . . .*" (VII,36,6).

This is not the kind of reasoning one expects to find in a prayer. On the contrary, one gets rather the impression that these are the words of someone, most probably the compiler of AC, who wants to warn against an overestimation of the importance of the Sabbath at the expense of that of the Lord's day. This being the case, one may ask for whom this warning is meant. The most plausible answer is that it is addressed to Christians who actually used the Sabbath blessings incorporated by the compiler of AC, in their liturgy of the Sabbath. In this connexion, now, it is interesting to note that the author of the Didascalia in the twenty-sixth chapter, polemizes against Christians who, most probably, were Jewish Christians[53] and who are said to hold the Sabbath higher than the first day of the week.[54] For the rest, also from other sources we know that there were Jewish Christians who celebrated the Sabbath.[55]

If these conclusions are accepted, one may imagine the emergence of the Sabbath practice as attested by AC as follows. In the third and in the beginning of the fourth century, there were groups of Christians, most probably Jewish Christians, living in the area from which the Didascalia and AC derive, who observed the Lord's Day as well as the Sabbath and used quite superficially Christianized Sabbath blessings. In the course of the fourth century some of their Sabbath customs were taken over by other communities of the same region who thus far only had observed the Lord's Day. Several factors may have played a role in this adoption of the Saturday/Sabbath. Naturally it may be in relation to a growing interest in the Saturday and its liturgical celebration in the East (from the fourth century onwards). On the other hand, one may ask oneself if the author of AC did not still have an intention other than adapting to a new custom. Did the introduction of the Sabbath for him not have a strategic goal as well? One should at least allow for the possibility that in this way he attempted to find a compromise between Jewish and Gentile Christians. In fact, one may combat one's opponents, in this case the Jewish Christians,

by polemizing against them, as did the author of the Didascalia, but also by meeting them part of the way.

A Jewish-Christian Origin of Syriac Christianity?

Now that we have got a more precise idea of the Jewish traditions that have persisted in the Syriac Churches, about their diffusion, their antiquity and their background, we will come back to the intriguing question we have mentioned at the beginning of this article, that of the origins of Syriac Christianity. In how far does the evidence we have examined and the conclusions we have been able to draw from it, shed light on this question? Does this evidence indeed provide an argument in favour of the hypothesis of an Jewish Christian origin of the Syriac Churches?

In order to answer this question in an appropriate way, we will best start with a negative conclusion. It should be remarked that none of the sources reviewed thus far, has a Jewish-Christian background in the more strict sense of the word. Nowhere have we found traces of ritual practices that may be considered as characteristic of Jewish Christians. We did not come across any indication that circumcision was practiced. Further, from none of the mentioned sources may be deduced that Jewish feasts were celebrated, with the exception, of course, of Passover. In regard to this festival it should be admitted that the way it was celebrated was still strongly marked by its Jewish provenance. Yet this does not justify the conclusion that Syriac Christians were "Jewish Christians." One should not forget that even in its Quartodeciman form this festival was already profoundly Christianized. Finally, it has also become clear that, apart from the Apostolic Constitutions, the sources under discussion do not point to an observance of the Sabbath. On the contrary, with the exception of AC, they condemn it.

On the other hand, we have encountered a number of facts that are not so easy to reconcile with a purely Gentile Christian origin of Syriac Christianity. If, indeed, the majority of the Syriac Churches consisted mainly of Christians with a Gentile background, it remains difficult to explain why these communities adhered for such a long time to ritual practices that were clearly of Jewish origin and elsewhere were abolished or fell into oblivion. Conservatism and isolation from the rest of the Christian world alone hardly may account for it. A growing influence of Jewish or Judaizing Christians upon the originally Gentile Christian community at a somewhat later period is not to be precluded beforehand, but one can hardly imagine that attempts to impose the (continued) observance of Jewish ritual

practices on Christians who originally did not follow these, would have been succesful on such a large scale. A much more likely solution is to assume that a considerable number of the first Christian communities in the Syriac area consisted for a large part of Christians who came from Judaism. Some of these communities will have continued keeping observances that may be qualified as "Jewish Christian." To this category belongs for instance the Jewish-Christian community from which the *Kerygmata Petrou* derive, one of the main sources of the Pseudo-Clementine writings. Most probably also the opponents of the author of the Didascalia and the Christians who had adapted Jewish Sabbath blessings for the celebration of their Christianized sabbath, should be reckoned among these Jewish Christians. Some other communities, however, will soon have begun to develop in another direction. They will have comprised a considerable number of Jewish Christians, but also soon have become open to Gentile Christians and also will have started to recruit members among non-Jews. Some churches will even have consisted for the main part of the latter type of Christians. Most of these groups were open to Greek philosophical ideas and Gentile Christian (Antiochene) conceptions. For the rest, as a result of a certain conservatism, isolation and due to contacts with Christians of Jewish descent, belonging to exclusively Jewish Christian communities or otherwise, they preserved their oldest liturgical traditions which originated in Judaism and were profoundly marked by their Jewish roots. Even at a later period these churches incidentally still underwent influences from Jewish liturgy, be it in a direct, but unconscious way or indirectly through the intermediary of Jewish Christians. In the long run they took over more and more "Western" Christian traditions, but it was only by the fourth century that this occurred on a large scale and in an accelerated pace. And even after that time, in particular the so-called Nestorians, preserved a number of Jewish liturgical traditions that elsewhere have fallen into oblivion.

NOTES

[1] See for example S. Brock, Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources, *JJS* 30 (1979), 212-232, in particular 212-218.

[2] See for example S. Brock, Jewish Traditions, 218-223; further N. Séd, Les hymnes sur le Paradis de Saint Ephrem et les traditions juives, *Mus* 81 (1968), 455-501; S. Hidal, *Interpretatio syriaca. Die Kommentare des heiligen Ephräm des Syrers zu Genesis und Exodus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Auslegungsgeschichtlichen Stellung*, Coniectanea biblica. Old Testament Series 6, Lund 1974; T. Kronholm, *Motifs from Genesis 1-11 in the genuine hymns of Ephrem the Syrian with particular reference to the influence of Jewish exegetical traditions*, Coniectanea biblica. Old Testament Series 11, Lund 1978.

[3] Here mention should be made of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost (cf. R. Murray,

Symbols of Church and Kingdom, Cambridge 1975, 312-320; W. Cramer, *Der Geist Gottes und des Menschen in frühsyrischer Theologie*. Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 46, Münster 1978). For the Christology (of Efrem), cf. G. Rouwhorst, *Les hymnes pascales d'Ephrem de Nisibe*. Tome 1, Leiden 1989, 45-47.

[4] Cf. for instance, G. Kretschmar, Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Ursprung frühchristlicher Askese, *ZKG* 71 (1964), 27-67; G. Quispel, L'évangile selon Thomas et les origines de l'ascèse chrétienne, *Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme*, Paris 1965, 35-52.

[5] Cf. F. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, London 1904, 34. Further, among others A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, vol. 1, *CSCO* 184, Louvain 1958, 6-7; G. Kretschmar in several publications, particularly in: Ein Beitrag, and in: Die Bedeutung der Liturgiegeschichte für die Frage nach der Kontinuität des Judenchristentums in nachapostolischer Zeit, *Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme*, 113-137; G. Quispel, in numerous articles, among others in: The Discussion of Judaic Christianity, *VigChr* 22 (1968), 161-175 and: The Gospel of Thomas revisited, *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi* (ed. N. Barc), Québec/Louvain 1981, 218-66.

[6] This position is, among others, defended by H. Lietzmann in his influential *Geschichte der alten Kirche* (cf. the second edition of 1953, part II, p. 27) and, more recently, in particular by H. Drijvers, in numerous articles, notably in: Edessa und das jüdische Christentum, *VigChr* 24 (1970), 4-33; Facts and Problems in Early Syriac-Speaking Christianity, *The Second Century* 2 (1982), 157-75; East of Antioch. Forces and Structures in the Development of Early Christian Theology, in: *East of Antioch. Studies in Early Syriac Christianity*, London 1984, 1-27; Jews and Christians at Edessa, *JJS* 36 (1985), 88-102; Syrian Christianity and Judaism, in: J. Lieu, J. North, T. Rajak (ed.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians*, London/New York, 1992, 124-146.

[7] See for a survey of the available evidence and the relevant secondary literature R. Taft, Some Notes on the Bema in the East and West Syrian Traditions, *OCP* 34 (1968), 326-359.

[8] *Ephrem de Nisibe. Memre sur Nicomédie.* (ed. C. Renoux), *PO* 38,2-3, Turnhout 1975, 151-153. This interesting text has been published only recently and therefore it is not taken into account in the relevant secondary literature.

[9] Cf. R. Taft, Some Notes, 330-337 and further J. Dauvillier, L'ambon ou bêmâ dans les textes de l'Eglise chaldéenne et de l'Eglise syrienne au moyen âge, *Cahiers archéologiques* 6 (1952), 11-30 and S.H. Jammo, *La structure de la Messe chaldéenne*, *OCA* 207, Roma 1979.

[10] Cf. in particular D. Hickley, The Ambo in early Liturgical Planning, *HeyJ* VII (1968, 325-59 and further R. Coquin, Le <bima> des églises syriennes, *OrSyr* 10 (1965), 443-474, here 464-471.

[11] Cf. D. Hickley, The ambo, 419. In reality, however, the only indication of the existence of a bema in the middle of the room is a "patch of white plaster probably concealing the foundation of some projecting object, subsequently removed' (cf. L. Levine, The Synagogue of Dura-Europos, in: E. Levine (ed.), *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, Jerusalem 1981, 172-177, here 173. See further for this synagogue, C. Kraeling, The Synagogue. The Excavations at Doura-Europos. Final Report VIII, Part I, New Haven 1956.

[12] See for information concerning these synagogues the essays published in: L. Levine (ed.), *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*; *idem.* (ed.), *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia 1987 and especially D. Urman & P. Flesher, *Ancient Synagogues. Historical Analysis & Archaeological Discovery*, Two volumes, Leiden 1995.

[13] Actually, Hickley basis himself on two early examples, the Synagogue of Dura-

Europos (but see note 11) and the Synagogue of Alexandria, the Diplostoon to the bema of which references are made in the Tosefta (*Sukka* 4,6) and in the Talmud (*jSukka* 5,1 and *bSukka* 51b). For the rest, his conclusions are founded upon late, partly very late evidence, such as the writings of Maimonides and (European!) synagogues that date from the Middle Ages and even from the Renaissance and Baroque periods! (cf. The Ambo, 416-419).

[14] Mention should be made here of some older Galilean synagogues who have one or two bemas flanking the main entrance which is oriented towards Jerusalem! This is, to confine myself to the earliest examples, the case in Nabratein and Gush Halav (cf. D. Groh, The stratigraphic chronology of the Galilean Synagogue from the early Roman period through the early Byzantine period (ca. 420 C.E.), in: D. Urman/P. Flesher, *Ancient Synagogues*, 51-69, here 60-61; for Gush Halav, see also E. Meyers, Excavations at Gush Halav in Upper Galilee, in: *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, 75-77.

[15] See H. Liddell & R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, edition of 1968, 314.

[16] Cf. for what follows, G. Rouwhorst, Continuity and Discontinuity between Jewish and Christian liturgy, *Bijdragen* 54 (1993), 72-83 (reply to an article of D. Monshouwer about the reading of the Scriptures in the early Church, published in the same volume).

[17] Ed. M. Metzger, *Les constitutions apostoliques*, *SC* 320,329. 336, Paris 1985-1987.

[18] Ed. W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, Edinburg 1864, 27; cf. also A. Vööbus, *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac*, *CSCO* 401/402, 44 (38). Cf. for questions regarding the origin of this document, W. Witakowski, The origin of the "Teaching of the Apostles," in: *IV Symposium syriacum 1984*, *OCA* 229, Roma 1987, 161-171.

[19] Ed. G. Philips, *The Doctrine of Addai*, London 1876, 46.

[20] Cf. for these systems F. Burkitt, *The Early Syriac Lectionary System*, Proceedings of the British Academy 10 (1921-1923), 301-339; A. Baumstark, *Nichtevangelische syrische Perikopenordnungen des ersten Jahrtausends*, *LQF* 15, 1921, 78-130; O. Heiming, Ein jakobitisches Doppellektionar des Jahres 824 aus Harran in den Handschriften British Museum Add. 14485-14487, in: *Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, Münster 1970, 768-799; K. Jenner, *De perikopentitels van de geïllustreerde Syrische kanselbijbel van Parijs (MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Syriaque 341)*, Leiden 1993.

[21] Cf. for these systems A. Baumstark, *Nichtevangelische syrische Perikopenordnungen*, 8-77; W. Macomber, The Chaldean Lectionary System of the Cathedral Church of Kokhe, *OCP* 33 (1967), 483-516; P. Kannookadan, *The East Syrian Lectionary. An Historico-Liturgical Study*, Rome 1991.

[22] Cf. G. Rouwhorst, Continuity and Discontinuity, and also A.-G. Martimort, A propos du nombre des lectures à la messe, *RSR* 58 (1984), 42-51 (= *idem.*, *Mirabile laudis canticum. Mélanges liturgiques*, Bibliotheca <Ephemerides Liturgicae>, Subsidia 60, Roma 1991, 125-135.

[23] *Apology* I,67. From the passage it becomes clear that pericopes were taken both from the Old Testament and the New Testament. One should, however, admit that Justin does not say anything about the number of the lections and the order in which they were read (so rightly J. Salzmann, *Lehren und Ermahnen*, Tübingen 1994, 248).

[24] Cf. F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Meßliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts*, *OCA* 187, Rome 1970, 103-108.

[25] *Explanatio in ps.* 118, c. XVII, 10 (*PL* 14,1143).

[26] Cf. the Armenian Lectionary that reflects the liturgical customs of Jerusalem at the

end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century (ed. A. Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121, PO* 35/1 and 36/2, Turnhout 1969 & 1971.

[27] Cf. A. Chavasse, L'Epistolier romain du Codex de Wurtzbourg, son organisation, *Revue bénédictine* 91(1981), 280-331, especially p. 322, where he distances himself of the widespread view, formerly upheld also by himself, according to which the oldest Roman liturgical sources would contain traces of an old system of three pericopes.

[28] There are two excellent critical editions available: W. Macomber, The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, *OCP* 32 (1966), 335-371 and A. Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*, Oxford 1992.

[29] Ed. J. Sauget, *Anaphora Syriaca Sancti Petri Apostoli tertia*, Anaphorae Syriacae II,3, Rome 1973, 273-329.

[30] Cf. for the relationship between the two anaphoras and their common origin, H. Engberding, Urgestalt, Eigenart und Entwicklung eines altantiochenischen eucharistischen Hochgebetes, *OrChr* 7 (1932), 32-48; *idem.*, Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet der ostsyrischen Liturgie der Apostel Addaj und Mar(j), *OrChr* 41 (1957), 32-48; W. Macomber, The Maronite and Chaldean Versions of the Anaphora of the Apostles, *OCP* 37 (1971), 55-84; *idem.*, The Ancient Form of the *Anaphora of the Apostles*, in: *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, ed. N. Garsoïan, T. Mathews and R. Thomson, Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, 1982, 73-88; A. Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer*, 65-123.

[31] Thus H. Engberding, Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet, and G. Rouwhorst, Bénédiction, action de grâces, supplication. Les oraisons de la table dans le Judaïsme et les célébrations eucharistiques des chrétiens syriaques, *QLP* 61 (1980), 211-240.

[32] On this point I disagree with W. Macomber and, as far as the absence of the anamnesis in the original text is concerned, also with A. Gelston. Cf. the remarks I have made about Macomber's reconstruction in my article *La célébration de l'Eucharistie dans l'Eglise primitive*, *QL* 74 (1993), 89-111, in particular 103 and my recension of Gelston's monography in *JSS* 40 (1995), 157-160, in particular 160.

[33] Cf. H. Wegman, Pleidooi voor een tekst; de anaphora van de apostelen Addai en Mari, *Bijdr* 40 (1979), 15-43; G. Rouwhorst, Bénédiction, 231-239.

[34] Cf. for what follows, G. Rouwhorst, Bénédiction, 231-239.

[35] It has to be admitted that, apart from the parallels with the birkat ha-mazon, the common core of AM and Sharar contains also some structural and verbal correspondances with the two benedictions preceding the recitation of the Shema in the Jewish morning service, as has been noted by J. Vellian (The Anaphoral Structure of Addai and Mari, *Mus* 85 (1972), 201-223). It remains, however, difficult to decide if this affinity may be ascribed to an influence of these Jewish benedictions upon AM, as Vellian argues (cf. the sceptical remarks of Gelston in his monography, p. 70).

I leave here out of consideration the presence of the Sanctus and its introduction in the common core of AM and Sharar. This is not because I have doubts about the Jewish origin of this prayer or about its belonging to the pristine form of AM. The problem, however, is that the integration of the Sanctus in the anaphora is not a feature specific to Syriac-speaking Christianity and a debate is going on about the question whether the Eucharistic Sanctus originated in Antioch or its vicinity (Syria) and from there spread to other Churches, or whether it was borrowed from another Christian tradition, for example that of Egypt (which itself may have been influenced by the

Jewish liturgy). Cf. for this question R. Taft, The interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora: When and Where? A Review of the Dossier, *OCP* 57 (1991), 281-308; 58 (1992), 83-121 and B. Spinks, *The sanctus in the eucharistic prayer*, Cambridge 1991, especially 115-116.

[36] Cf. *Didascalia Apostolorum* ch. 21, ed. Vööbus, *CSCO* 407/408), p. 247 (229) and ch. 26 (*ibidem*, 251 (233); Ephrem, *Sermo de Fide III*, ed. E. Beck, *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Sermones de Fide, CSCO* 212/213, Louvain 1961, 23-32 = 33-45; Aphrahat, *Demonstratio* XIII, ed. R. Graffin, *Patrologia syriaca* I,1, p. 541-571.

[37] K. Kohler, Didascalia, *Jewish Encyclopedia* (ed. I. Singer), vol. 4, New York 1903, 592-594; *Idem.*, The Essene Version of the Seven Benedictions as Preserved in the vii Book of the Apostolic Constitutions, *Hebrew Union College Annual* 1 (1924), 410-25; *Idem.*, *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church*, New York 1927, 257-59.

[38] W. Bousset, Eine jüdische Gebetssamlung im siebenten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen; Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1915 (1916), 438-85; reprinted in: D.W. Bousset, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien. Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters*, hrsg. von A.F. Verheule, Leiden 1979, 231-86.

[39] E.R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, New Haven 1935.

[40] D.A. Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish; An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Brown Judaic Studies 65, Chico 1985.

[41] See especially D. Fiensy, *Prayers*, 129-144; 165-187.

[42] Epiphanius, *De fide* 24,7; Socrates, *H.E.* 5,22 (*PG* 67,636); Sozomenos, *H.E.* 7,19 (*PG* 67, 1477); Cassien, *Inst. Coenob.* 2,6 and 3,2; Ethiopian version of the Apostolic Tradition, ch. 22 (ed. B. Botte, *La Tradition apostolique de Saint Hippolyte, LQF* 39, Münster 1989[5], 60).

[43] G. Rouwhorst, *Les hymnes pascales d'Ephrem de Nisibe. Analyse théologique et recherche sur l'évolution de la fête pascale chrétienne à Nisibe et à Edesse et dans quelques Eglises voisines au quatrième siècle*, Supplements to Vigiliae christianae VII,1/2, Leiden 1989; cf. *idem.*, The Date of Easter in the Twelfth Demonstration of Aphraates, *StPatr* XVII (éd. E. Livingstone), Oxford/New York 1982, 1374-1380; *idem.*, L'évocation du mois de Nisan dans les hymnes <sur la résurrection> d'Ephrem de Nisibe, in: *IV Symposium Syriacum 1984, OCA* 229, Rome 1987, 101-110.

[44] Cf. Ephrem's Paschal Hymnes (ed. E. Beck, *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Paschahymnen (De Azymis, de Crucifixione, de Resurrectione), CSCO* 248/249, Louvain 1964; Aphrahat, *Demonstratio XII, PS I/1*, 504-540.

[45] Ed. O. Perler, *Méliton de Sardes. Sur la Pâque et fragments, SC* 123, Paris 1966 et S. Hall, *Melito of Sardis. On Pascha and fragments*, Oxford 1979.

[46] Ed. P. Nautin, *Homélies pascales I. Une homélie inspirée du traité sur la Pâque d'Hippolyte, SC* 27, Paris 1950; G. Visonà, *Pseudo Ippolito. In sanctum Pascha. Studio edizione commento*, Studia Patristica Mediolensia 15, Milano 1988.

[47] Ed. A. Vööbus, *CSCO* 407/408, 203-218 (184-202). See for my analysis of this chapter *Les hymnes pascales* I, 157-193.

[48] Cf. for questions related to the Quartodeciman Passover and the controversy it occasioned in the middle of the second century C.E., B. Lohse, *Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner (BTChTh.M 54)*, Gütersloh 1953 and my article The Quartodeciman Passover and the Jewish, Pesach, *QL* 77 (1996) (forthcoming).

[49] In my opinion the hypothesis proposed by G.Kunze according to which the custom of reading from the Tora and the Prophets during the Eucharist was introduced in the

third century in Antioch and from there would have spread to other more eastern regions (Die Lesungen, in: *Leitourgia* II, Kassel 1955, 87-179, here especially 135-38), lacks a solid foundation. One gets the impression that K. does not argue on the basis of compelling arguments but rather starts from the questionable assumption that the liturgy of the Syriac-speaking Christians has resembled that of the Paulinian churches.

[50] Cf. H. Wegman, Généalogie hypothétique de la prière eucharistique, *QL* 61 (1980), 263-278; *idem.*, Genealogie des Eucharistiegebetes, *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 33 (1961), 193-216.

[51] Thus, for instance D. Fiensy, *Prayers alleged to be Jewish*, 219.

[52] B. Spinks, *The sanctus*, 53.

[53] Thus G. Strecker, On the Problem of Jewish Christianity, in: W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, London 1972, 241-285, especially 254-257, who on this point disagrees with R. Connolly and particularly W.van Unnik who held the opponents of the author of the Didascalia to be "Judaizing Christians" (cf. W. van Unnik, De beteekenis van de Mozaïsche wet voor de Kerk van Christus volgens de Syrische Didascalie, in: *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, NS*, 31 (1940), 65-100; slightly expanded version: The Significance of Moses' Law for the Church of Christ according to the Syriac Didascalia, published in: *Sparsa Collecta. The collected essays of W.C. van Unnik*, Part Three, Leiden 1983, 7-39).

[54] Ed. A. Vööbus, 251 (233).

[55] See especially Hippolytus, *Ref. IX,16,3;* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* III,27,5; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 19,5,1; 29,7,5; 30, 2,2; 30,17,5; Jerome, *Epistula* 112, 13; *In Matth.* 12,2.

I like to thank Maurits Sinninghe Damsté for the correction of my English.

3435 GR *Nieuwegein*, Velduil 64

REVIEWS

Origène, *Homélies sur les Psaumes 36 à 38.* Texte critique établi par Emanuela Prinzivalli, introduction, traduction et notes par Henri Crouzel, s.j. et Luc Brésard. o.c.s.o (Sources Chrétiennes 411). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1995. 494 p. 291 F.

Origène a beaucoup écrit et prêché sur les Psaumes. Les neuf homélies présentées ici, sont les seules œuvres entières que nous ayons conservées par une traduction de Rufin. Dans son Prologue, Rufin explique pourquoi il a traduit ces homélies. Elles sont un exposé entièrement moral, que pourront comprendre facilement des femmes pieuses et des intelligences simples, et spécialement Avita, épouse du destinataire Apronianus et nièce de Mélanie l'Ancienne, la noble veuve qui avait fondé avec Rufin le monastère de Mont des Oliviers.

Le texte, repris sans l'apparat critique, a été fourni par Emanuela Prinzivalli, qui l'avait publié dans une édition italienne de grande valeur en 1991 (Origène, *Omilie sui salmi*, Nardini Editore, Firenze) dans la collection "Biblioteca Patristica."

Les trois auteurs mentionnés dans le titre ont tous contribué à l'Introduction. La traduction est de L. Brésard, revue par H. Crouzel.

Le texte latin a été imprimé d'une façon impeccable. La traduction est exacte et clair. On a ajouté les fragments grecs conservés, avec une traduction française.

Un seul passage ne me semble pas avoir été bien compris par les traducteurs. Ce sont les premiers mots de la première homélie. Origène commence ainsi:

Multifarie multisque modis Deus locutus est patribus in prophetis. Aliquando quidem ineffabilia sacramenta nos edocet in his quae loquitur, aliquando autem de Salvatore et de eius adventu nos instruit, interdum vero mores nostros corrigit et emendat. Propter quod nos temptabimus per loca singula Scripturae divinae huiuscemodi differentias assignare et discernere ubi prophetiae sint et de futuris dicatur, ubi autem mystica aliqua indicantur, ubi vero moralis est locus.

Les traducteurs trouvent dans ce passage en particulier dans la dernière phrase, la théorie origénienne du quadruple sens de l'Écriture. Dans une note on lit:

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

'De fait, on devine ici ce quadruple sens: le sens littéral fait l'objet de l'exposé. "On parle aussi du futur," c'est le sens anagogique, application à l'eschatologie du sens mystique qui lui-même sera développé quelquefois: "On indique quelque sens mystique." Enfin le "sens moral" qui prévaudra dans ce commentaire, comme Rufin nous en avait averti, applique à l'âme dans l'Église la leçon dégagée du sens littéral.'

Mais de cette façon ils forcent le texte. Il me semble évident qu'Origène dit ici qu'on peut discerner dans l'Écriture *trois sortes de textes*: parfois Dieu nous enseigne d'ineffables mystères, parfois il nous instruit du Sauveur et de sa venue, parfois il redresse nos moeurs. Aussi Origène essaiera-t-il pour chaque texte, d'en indiquer le caractère et de discerner 1) où il contient des prophéties et parle du futur (il s'agit ici d'*une* catégorie qui correspond à *quae loquuntur . . . de Salvatore et de eius adventu*), 2) où on indique quelques mystères (correspondant à *ineffabilia sacramenta nos edocet*), et 3) où le passage a un sens moral (correspondant à *mores nostros corrigit*).

Les trois "*ubi*" correspondent aux trois "parfois" (*aliquando, aliquando, interdum*). Par l'introduction d'un quatrième "où" ("où il y a des prophéties et *où* l'on parle du futur") les traducteurs détruisent la structure du texte. Il ne s'agit donc pas ici du triple (ou quadruple) sens de l'Écriture, c'est-à-dire du triple sens d'*un même texte*, comme Origène l'expose dans le *Peri Archôn* IV 2, 4, mais du fait qu'il y a trois sortes de textes: des textes mystiques, prophétiques et moraux. Les trois psaumes qu'Origène va exposer appartiennent à la dernière catégorie. Les éditeurs en ont fait une édition de qualité.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

E.P. Meijering, *Athanasius: Die dritte Rede gegen die Arianer.* Teil I: Kapitel 1-25. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Amsterdam, Gieben, 1996. 268 S.

Athanasius nimmt in den wissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen von E.P. Meijering eine hervorragende Stelle ein. Vor fast 30 Jahren verteidigte er seine Doktorarbeit *Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius* (Leiden 1968, ²1974). In 1984 kehrte er nach verschiedenen anderen Arbeiten zu Athanasius zurück und übersetzte und kommentierte *Contra Gentes*. (*Athanasius: Contra Gentes*, Introduction, Translation and Commentary, Leiden 1984). Fünf Jahre später folgte *Athanasius: De Incarnatione Verbi*. Einleitung, Übersetzung

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

und Kommentar (Amsterdam 1989). Und jetzt liegt eine Übersetzung mit Kommentar des ersten Teils der dritten Rede gegen die Arianer vor.

Meijerings Methode wird den Lesern inzwischen bekannt sein. Jede Einheit von zwei oder drei Kapiteln wird eingeleitet, und jeder Satz wird dann übersetzt und interpretiert. Der griechische Text geht stets voran. Der Kommentar zeigt die grosse Vertrautheit des Verf. mit den Werken des Athanasius, was nach dem oben Gesagten über seine früheren Veröffentlichungen niemanden verwundern wird.

Der Verf. hatte mit diesem Werk noch eine spezielle Absicht. Er wollte zeigen, dass die Argumente für die Unechtheit dieser dritten Rede, die neulich von Kannengiesser ins Feld geführt sind, nicht stichhaltig sind. Echtheitsfragen sind immer schwer zu lösen. Eine Fälschung kann soviel Übereinstimmung mit den echten Werken aufweisen, dass der Leser irregeführt wird. Für die Annahme einer solchen Fälschung soll man jedoch gute Argumente haben. Der Verf. hat meines Erachtens in diesem Kommentar gezeigt, dass Kannengiessers Argumente nicht überzeugend sind. Oft sind sogar rein sachlich Feststellungen unrichtig. Die Auseinandersetzungen des Verf. sind von vorbildlicher Klarheit.

2312GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Grégoire de Nysse, *Homélies sur l'Ecclésiaste*. Texte grec de l'édition P. Alexander. Introduction, traduction, notes et index par Françoise Vinel (Sources Chrétiennes 416). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 446 p. 298 F.

Grégoire a dédié huit homélies aux chapitres 1-3,13 de l'*Ecclésiaste*. Comme l'auteur le montre dans son Introduction, on a affaire ici à un ouvrage achevé (p. 24). Elle montre aussi que Grégoire, comme Origène, considère la trilogie attribuée à Salomon, les *Proverbes*, l'*Ecclésiaste* et le *Cantique des Cantiques*, comme pendants des trois parties de la philosophie grecque, éthique, physique et époptique. L'*Ecclésiaste* est le livre de la physique. Son thème dominant est la vanité de toutes choses. Les homélies I-V empruntent leur unité à ce thème. Dans les homélies VI-VIII Grégoire élabore les conséquences de cette vanité pour la vie chrétienne par une explication d'*Eccl.* 3,1-8 "Il y a un temps pour tout. . . ." Dans son Introduction l'auteur discute, à part les questions de la date de l'ouvrage et sa place dans l'œuvre de Grégoire et la tradition du texte, quelques points spéciaux concernant ces huit homélies, p.ex. comment l'*Ecclésiaste* est selon

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Grégoire d'une part un livre de la physique, et d'autre part un livre pour l'Église (*Ecclesia* ~ *Ecclésiaste*), et comment il élabore la conception du temps. Chaque homélie est précédée d'un bref aperçu.

Le texte grec a été emprunté, avec quelques modifications, à l'édition de P. Alexander (*Gregorii Nysseni Opera* V de 1962) sans l'apparat critique.

La traduction de ce texte assez difficile est en général correcte. Toutefois elle manque parfois de précision, spécialement dans la première homélie. J'en donne quelques exemples.

En Hom. I 2 Grégoire discute le nom "Ecclésiaste." Il se demande pourquoi ce livre est le seul à avoir le privilège de ce nom. Il explique: ὅτι ταῖς μὲν ἄλλαις πάσαις γραφαῖς, ἱστορίαις τε καὶ προφητείαις, καὶ πρὸς ἄλλα τινὰ τῶν μὴ πάνυ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ χρησίμων ὁ σκοπὸς βλέπει . . . Ἡ δὲ τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου διδασκαλία πρὸς μόνην βλέπει τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν πολιτείαν. L'auteur traduit la première partie de ce texte comme suit: "que le but de tous les autres écrits, historiques et prophétiques, concerne pour chacun d'eux des faits qui ne sont pas absolument utiles à l'Église." Mais comment peut-on s'imaginer que Grégoire voudrait dire que tous ces autres écrits ne sont pas utiles pour l'Église? En effet, il ne le dit pas. L'auteur néglige le καί avant πρὸς ἄλλα τινά. Grégoire dit que tous ces autres écrits concernent *aussi* des autres choses qui ne sont pas utiles pour l'Église (comme guerres, mariages, etc.), tandis que l'*Ecclésiaste* concerne seulement la vie de l'Église. On se demande d'où viennent dans la traduction les mots "pour chacun d'eux." De πρὸς ἄλλα τινά?

I 3,2 Grégoire explique le terme μάταιον. "Vain," dit-il, est une chose qui n'a d'être que dans la seule enonciation du mot, et il ajoute: πρᾶγμα δ' ὑφεστὸς τῇ τοῦ ὀνόματος σημασίᾳ οὐ συνεμφαίνεται. L'auteur traduit: "La réalité concrète n'apparaît pas avec la signification du nom." Ici l'article "La" n'est pas correct. Il n'y a pas d'article dans le grec. Alors il faut traduire "Une réalité."

I 3, 28-30 Ματαιότης ἐστὶν ἢ ῥῆμα ἀδιανόητον ἢ πρᾶγμα ἀνόνητον ἢ βουλὴ ἀνυπόστατος ἢ σπουδὴ πέρας οὐκ ἔχουσα. L'auteur traduit: "la 'vanité,' c'est un mot qui *n'a pas de sens*, ou une *action sans succès*, ou un vouloir sans fondement, *ou un empressement sans limite.*" Mais à mon avis Grégoire parle d'un *mot irréfléchi*, d'une *chose inutile* et d'un *effort sans aboutissement.*

I 4,4-5 Grégoire parle de l'habitude de l'Écriture ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸς τὸ κρεῖττον νοουμένων. On traduit: "concernant les notions exprimées au comparatif." Mais il ne s'agit pas dans ce passage d'un comparatif, mais de l'expression "vanité des vanités." A mon avis Grégoire veut examiner la façon de parler habituelle de l'Écriture "concernant les réalités les meilleures"

(Cf. la traduction latine chez Migne: (ea) quae intelliguntur esse meliora et praestantiora).

I 8,20 Grégoire explique l'usage de πνεῦμα en *Eccl.* 1,6: ἀπὸ μέρους ἅπαν ὀνομάζων τὸ ἀνθρώπινον *πνεῦμα*. "Par la partie il nomme la totalité humaine 'pneuma.'" En d'autres termes Salomon fait usage de la figure *pars pro toto.* Mais l'auteur combine τὸ ἀνθρώπινον avec πνεῦμα et traduit: "et par la partie le texte nomme le tout, en parlant du souffle humain."

I 9,8 ὅσοις δὲ ἐπίπονος ὁ πρὸς ἀρετὴν δοκεῖ βίος. L'auteur traduit: "Mais ceux dont la vie parait pénible par comparaison avec leur vertu." A mon avis Grégoire parle ici de "ceux pour qui la vie vertueuse (lett. la vie vers la vertu) semble pénible."

I 13,30 ss. Grégoire explique les deux verbes d'*Eccl.* 1,9 γεγονός et πεποιημένον. Ces deux verbes, dit-il, montrent la différence entre l'âme et la chair: Γέγονεν ἡ ψυχῆ καὶ τὸ σῶμα πεποίηται. L'auteur traduit: "L'ame *a été* et le corps a été fait." Grégoire poursuit: "Ce n'est pas parce que ces mots signifient une chose puis l'autre que le texte a utilisé cette différence de mots." Mais peut-on dire qu'il n'y a de différence entre "a été" et "a été fait"? A mon avis, il faut traduire γέγονε par "est devenu." Grégoire dit que Salomon fait usage de ces deux termes ἵνα σοι δῷ τα πρόσφορα περὶ ἑκατέρου λόγιζεσθαι L'auteur traduit: "pour que *les mots adaptés* te permettent de réfléchir sur chacun d'elles." A mon avis Grégoire dit: "pour qu'ils (ces mots) te permettent d'avoir des idées justes sur chacun": τὰ προσφορά est l'objet de λογίζεσθαι, et non pas le sujet de δῷ.

Dans son explication de la différence Grégoire dit: . . . κατ' ἀρχὰς γέγονεν ἡ ψυχή. L'auteur traduit: "l'âme *a été* dès l'origine." Que signifie celà? Un existence éternelle? A mon avis Grégoire dit que "l'âme *est devenu* au commencement."

I 14,1 Διὸ τούτοις ἐπάγει καὶ τὸ ἀκόλουθον λέγων ὅτι ἔξω τοῦ ἀρχαίου ἐστὶν οὐδέν. L'auteur traduit: "Aussi ajoute-t-il à cela la suite du texte, en disant que rien n'existe en dehors de ce qui est retourné à son état primitif." A mon avis Grégoire dit ici que Salomon ajoute *ce qui s'ensuit*, en disant qu'il n'y a rien en dehors de ce qui est ancien.

II 5, 11-12 οἷς οὐκ ἔστι κατ' ἐξουσίαν τὸ καταθύμιον signifie "ceux qui n'ont pas en leur pouvoir ce qu'ils désirent." L'auteur traduit: "(la plupart des hommes) qui désirent ce qui n'est pas en leur pouvoir."

En V 6,67 et VIII 2,116 on trouve le terme οἴησις, qui a été traduit par "pensée" et "opinion." A mon avis ce terme a dans ces deux cas une signification péjorative: idée fausse, arrogance, outrecuidance. Cela vaut aussi du terme latin "opinio." Ambroise commence sa première homélie sur

l'*Exameron* ainsi: "Tantumne opinionis adsumpsisse homines . . ." J. Pépin traduit: "A quel dégré d'outrecuidance les hommes n'en sont-il parvenus!" (Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne, Paris 1964, p. 11-12). Il me faut avouer que j'ai fait la même faute dans ma traduction de ces mots en *Vigiliae Christianae* 16 (1962), 205.

Traduire demeure une entreprise comportant beaucoup de risques.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

F. Stanley Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity. Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* 1.27-71 (Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations 37, Christian Apocrypha Series 2). Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia 1995. XIV and 208 pages.

The Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* belong to the most enigmatic writings of early Christian literature. This applies in the first place to the literary relationship of the two writings, which can only be explained by the supposition of a common "Grundschrift." The contents and extent of this "Grundschrift" and those of several other sources is a matter of ongoing research. In addition to this the Jewish-Christian elements in these writings are a second motive for continual debate. Both writings are usually dated about 400, but this does not say much about the date of the various sources. The place of their origin is usually supposed to be somewhere in the East.

The title of the present book shows that it focuses on the chapters 1,27-71 of the Recognitions, which is to be regarded a separate source of Jewish-Christian character. In the Historical Survey at the beginning of this book it emerges that 1.27-71 has been considered to be a separate source from the time of A. Hilgenfeld in the middle of the nineteenth century. Modern studies of this subject are based on G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Texte und Untersuchungen 70, Berlin 1958, see especially pp. 221-254). His conclusions have been neatly summarised by J. Louis Martyn, "Clementine Recognitions 1,33-71, Jewish Christianity, and the Fourth Gospel," in: *God's Christ and His People.* Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl, edited by Jacob Jervell and Wayne A. Meeks, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo etc. 1977, pp. 265-295, and later used by G. Lüdemann in *Paulus der Heidenapostel II* (Forsch. zur Rel. und Lit. des A.u.N.T. 130, Göttingen 1983, pp. 228-257).

The main contribution of the present work is a fresh translation of *Rec.*

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

1,27-71 based upon the most reliable texts, which have come down to us in Latin, Syriac and partially in Armenian. According to the Preface, this text will be the basis of a future commentary on this passage.

After this translation a chapter follows on "Isolation of the Source Material." Its contents are a necessary starting point for the forthcoming commentary. They give an idea of the problems connected with the Pseudo-Clementines in general and their source material in particular. From the study by Lüdemann cited above we gather that the Jewish-Christian source shows an anti-Pauline character and in that of Martyn it is shown that a relationship with the Fourth Gospel is not to be excluded. But parallels also exist with Epiphanius' *Panarion* on the Ebionites, with the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of the Ebionites, Hegesippus, the second Apocalypse of James and the writings of Justin Martyr, but in none of these cases may we speak of an immediate dependency. This means that we have to assume underlying Jewish-Christian traditions. Up to the present these traditions have hardly been an object of systematic investigation.

The author of this book gives us an excellent survey of the present state of affairs with regard to this Jewish-Christian source and an extremely useful translation of its text. Hopefully both will open the way to a full-scale commentary, which we await in eager expectation.

9751 NG *Haren*, Dilgtweg 18A A.F.J. Klijn

Christoph Riedweg, *Ps.-Justin (Markell von Ankyra?) Ad Graecos De vera religione (bisher "Cohortatio ad Graecos"): Einleitung und Kommentar*. Teil I: Einleitung, Teil II: Kommentar. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 25. Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag, Basel 1994. x + 711 pages.

Daniel Ridings, *The Attic Moses: the Dependency Theme in Some Early Christian Writers*. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 59. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, Göteborg 1995. 270 pages. Price SKr 200.

Tryggve Göransson, *Albinus, Alcinous, Arius Didymus*, Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 61. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, Göteborg 1995. 257 pages. Price SKr 200.

The first two books under review have in common that they both focus on aspects of the long tradition of Christian apologetics. Building on the foundations laid by Hellenistic-Jewish apologists, Christian intellectuals wrote treatises in which they defended their convictions against the attacks of pagan opponents, often going on the offensive themselves and attack-

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

ing the cherished views of pagan hellenism. The best known representatives of this tradition are the early apologists of the 2nd century such as Athenagoras and Justin, manfully struggling against the cultural dominance and intellectual arrogance of their adversaries. But the tradition goes on for at least another three centuries, until by the time of the fifth century there are not many pagans left to attack, and polemical energies have to be redirected in other directions, against dogmatic opponents, heretics and Jews. It would be useful to have an overview of this body of literature comparable to Heinz Schreckenberg's invaluable survey of the *Adversus Judaeos* literature (Frankfurt-Bern 1982). It is a pity that there is no list of such works in the index volume of the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum.*

The first book is the published version of the *Habilitationschrift* of Christoph Riedweg accepted by the University of Zürich in 1992. A student of Walter Burkert, Riedweg had earlier published his dissertation on mystery terminology in Plato, Philo and Clement (see review by J.C.M. van Winden in this journal, 44 (1990) 308 f.). Since then he has been appointed to the chair of Greek in Mainz. He is thus a Greek scholar with a strong interest in Jewish and Christian writings in their relation to the tradition of Hellenism. As he points out in the Preface to his monumental study, few of the works of the Greek and Latin apologists have been the subject of full-scale commentaries. Most editions have useful apparatus and most translations are accompanied by valuable notes, but neither can replace what is supplied by a detailed philological commentary. On the advice of Jean Pépin, Riedweg decided to focus on the ps.Justinian work *Cohortatio ad Graecos.* A few years ago M. Marcovich published a new edition of this work with an extensive apparatus testimoniorum which could be said to amount to a kind of commentary *in nuce* (see my review in this journal 45 (1991) 399-403). We now see the limits of what a meritorious text edition can achieve and how much more illuminating a full-scale commentary can be.

In the first volume all the general questions regarding the treatise are examined in a thorough fashion. Riedweg agrees with Marcovich (but on different grounds) against Geffcken that the structure of the work does have a slightly awkward but efficacious unity. There can of course be no doubt that it was not written by the early apologist Justin. A definite *terminus post quem* is supplied by the *Chronicle* of Julianus Africanus, i.e. 221. But there are also a number of detailed points which suggest that the author is reacting to the writings of the philosopher Porphyry. In two long and highly interesting chapters, which I would recommend to every reader, the work is discussed as an intellectual document and as an apologetic treatise. In

both cases many factors point to a date in the early fourth century. Riedweg particularly emphasizes the extensive parallels with the apologetic *œuvre* of Eusebius.

Of all pagan authors it is Plato the philosopher and Homer the teacher of religion who play the dominant roles. The author knows some of Plato's works directly, and is not wholly dependent on manuals and quotes taken over from other writers. If he is to be dated to the early 4th century, it might be thought surprising that the presentation of Plato's thought that emerges is much closer to the Middle Platonist picture of Plato than that developed by Neoplatonists such as Plotinus and Iamblichus. But this is consonant with what we find in other contemporary Christian authors such as Eusebius, Lactantius and even Calcidius. Christian intellectuals preferred to deal with the Plato of the philologist Longinus than the Plato of a philosopher such as Plotinus. Riedweg is quite right to emphasize that many of the contradictions that ps.Justin locates in Plato's doctrine are the result of adaptation of interpretative disputes, above all in relation to the best-known and most controversial dialogue of them all, the *Timaeus*. The background that is sketched in often extends far beyond the words of the apologist himself, but is invariably illuminating. It might have been profitable, I believe, to pay a little more attention to the actual argumentative methods used by the apologist to expose Plato's inconsistencies and weaknesses, as seen in the following example. In § 22.4 the author states that Plato calls God not the ποιητής but the δημιουργός of the gods. Riedweg points out that this observation is strictly speaking not correct (since ποιητής, δημιουργός and θεός are used indiscriminately), but that it does remind us of the Middle Platonist discussions on the difference between the terms ποιητής and πατήρ in the famous description at *Tim.* 28a3. He then contends that the author has adapted the distinction in line with the use of the verb ποιέω in Gen. 1:1. What I missed in his comments on this passage in the Introduction (93-95) and in the Commentary proper (395) was the observation that ps.Justin has in mind here a very *specific* text, namely *Tim.* 41a7, where the demiurge in a difficult phrase (I simplify somewhat) is called θεῶν δημιουργὸς πατήρ τε. In terms of a literal (and philological) reading of the text it is obvious to ask why Plato should vary the phrase in 28c3 ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα. Our author, who is intensely preoccupied with the relation between the One God and the many gods of polytheism, asks why Plato deliberately alters his terminology. This way of reading the text, involving a heavy literalism and making no effort at all to take into account matters such as stylistic *variatio*, is very typical of ancient inter-school dis-

cussion. One is reminded of Plutarch's literalistic and often tendentious attacks on the Stoa in *De Stoicorum repugnantiis*. Riedweg finds it difficult to determine whether the author derived his material on Plato's inconsistencies from discussions within the Platonist school or from attacks on the school from the outside (81). Perhaps we should allow the author a little more personal creativity in this area. Like other church fathers, he knew the methods of polemic and applied them without hesitation. Riedweg cannot find any parallel for the statement in § 7.1 that Plato added a fourth principle, viz. the ungenerated soul. Here too Christian preoccupation with the question of μοναρχία might have led the author himself to postulate an additional principle, based on his knowledge that some Middle Platonist authors regarded the World-soul as ἀγένητος.

The commentary is *very* extensive (pp. 198-530), dealing with the text phrase by phrase. It deliberately attempts to be exhaustive, we are informed (p. vi), because the place and personal contribution of an author working in a traditional context can only be determined if one's collection of relevant material is as complete as possible. The result is an enormous collection of thematic and verbal parallels printed in full in the original Greek (and to a lesser extent Latin). One can find one's way in it by consulting the very full indices or by referring to the original text (a fuller index verborum is found in Marcovich's edition). This will surely become one of those indispensable works of reference—comparable with Waszink's *De anima* and Pépin's *Theologie cosmique*—that one will turn to when hunting for material in the area of pagan-Christian interaction. In three important appendices Riedweg gives (i) a *Lesetekst* which is more conservative than Marcovich's, but still contains a considerable number of his own emendations, (ii) a German translation, and (iii) a most valuable list of citations (presented in a five-fold classification!).

I have left the two most controversial aspects of Riedweg's research until last. Both can be deduced from the book's long and somewhat awkward title. Firstly it is convincingly shown through a detailed study of the work's contents that it is not a λόγος παραινετικός but a λόγος συμβουλευτικός. This means that the treatise's traditional title Λόγος παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλλήνας, which first appears in the *Sacra Parallela*, cannot be correct, but has been deduced from its opening words. What, then, was its original title? Riedweg suggests (Λόγος) Πρὸς Ἕλλήνας περὶ τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεοσεβείας, based on the introduction of the work's theme in § 1.2 and Latinized as *Ad Graecos de vera religione*. The suggestion is bold and not implausible. It would be strengthened if other cases could be shown where title and first introduction

of the main theme are identical in this way. All things considered, I think the attempt to supplant a traditional and well-known title by replacing it with an unproven conjecture (no matter how plausible) is a little *too* bold, and may well cause confusion in scholarly circles.

Secondly, as his research was drawing to an end, Riedweg made an exciting discovery. Using the "C" version of the TLG database on CD-ROM, he found that he kept on obtaining linguistic parallels between his unknown author and surviving fragments of the 4th century Monarchianist bishop and theologian Marcellus of Ancyra (c. 280-c. 375). A striking example is the fact that the favorite phrase of our author σαφῶς καὶ φανερῶς, which he uses no less than 12 times, is elsewhere—remarkably enough—found only in Marcellus (the newer "D' version reaches the same result). The identification broadly coheres with the results of Riedweg's research. Marcellus was a slightly younger contemporary of Eusebius. His monarchianist tendencies and Logos-doctrine fit in well with the theology implicit in the pseudonymous work. Also the dating in the first decades of the 4th century fits nicely. The only problem is that the work appears to presume Marcellus' mature theology, which would make it a couple of decades younger than one might expect, i.e. about 340 A.D. On the basis of his discovery Riedweg has added the name of Marcellus to his title, but—modestly, this time—added a question mark. Here I wonder whether he should not have stuck his neck out further. It would have been a challenge to consult literature on the use of the computer in the humanities and inquire whether the parallels he found were indeed sufficient to *prove* beyond all reasonable doubt that the author was Marcellus. On p. 172 we read 'Streng zu beweisen ist die Autorschaft des Markell mit diesen Parallelen wohl kaum.' This statement left me a little unsatisfied. At any rate I am persuaded that the author of the work more than likely was Marcellus. This adds an unexpectedly concrete aspect to the results of Riedweg's research. Because the work mentions Philo of Alexandria three times and also quotes from his *De vita Moysis*, I myself had occasion to examine it in my research on Philo's reception among the Fathers (see *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, Assen 1993, 184-189). On the basis of the identification with Marcellus it becomes much less plausible to place it in the context of the Alexandrian tradition as I did. One should sooner make the connection with Eusebius and, a little later, with the Cappadocians. A further comparison of the citations in the work with the contents of the Caesarean library as revealed in the *Praeparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius might have been instructive. But let us above all be grateful to the industrious author of

this impressive study for opening up such fascinating new avenues of research. All scholars interested in the history of Christian apologetics will be deeply in his debt.

The central theme in the second half of ps.Justin's (i.e. Marcellus') treatise is that an examination of the writings of the teachers of the Greeks will reveal their dependence on the revealed truth of the Christian religion. This is precisely the theme of the second book under review. Usually this apologetic motif has been called the "plagiarism" theme or the theme of the "theft of the philosophers." In a valuable introductory section Ridings argues that these labels are too negative and do not adequately cover the range of claims and attitudes found in Christian writings. As his title indicates, he considers the label "dependency theme" a better description, and we can only agree with him on this point (we note too that the term "Abhängigkeit" is already used by Riedweg, 123 ff.). The second important point that Ridings wishes to prove is that Christians used this theme in a polemical spirit, in order to discredit the claims of philosophers and other Greek intellectuals, and *not* in order to justify their own appropriation of pagan philosophical writings, as Lilla and others have argued. There is only one way to show this, he argues, and that is to look at the texts. The main body of the book consists of three long chapters in which all the examples of the dependency theme in Clement, Eusebius and Theodoret are listed and examined. It is a somewhat tedious exercise at times, but the results are worthwhile (see the useful tables on pp. 113-117, 190-193, 222-224). The evidence collected demonstrates the popularity of the theme and the aggressive manner in which it is put to use.

In his final chapter, entitled "The future of an illusion" Ridings briefly sets the use of the theme in a wider context. The contrast he makes with Hellenistic Judaism is overdrawn. Hengel's claim that Jewish apologetics are unacquainted with the "theft" motif is not correct, since it is very clearly stated by Philo at *QG* 4.152, where we read "Heracleitus, like a thief taking law and opinions from Moses . . . (translation Marcus)." We encounter here an unfortunate deficiency in our author's coverage of the secondary literature: this issue has been dealt with in detail not only by P. Pilhofer in his important study *Presbyteron kreitton: der Altersbeweis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur* (Tübingen 1990) 182 (reviewed by J.C.M. van Winden in this journal 45 (1991) 412 f.), but also in an article of N. Roth on this specific subject cited by Pilhofer *ad loc.* It is a pity that Ridings does not elaborate on the relation between his dependency theme and that of the "argument from antiquity." As Pilhofer notes (12), this argument often has the form:

X is a feature of P
Y is a feature of Q
but we know that P is older than Q
therefore Y is dependent on X

The important structural link between the two motifs might have been explored further.

Throughout his study Ridings makes it quite clear that the idea of dependency is not very intelligent and often rather absurd (note the title of the last chapter cited above). Of course he himself is intelligent enough to recognize that the scholar has to read his authors in the context of their time and not ours (cf. 11). Nevertheless the unease remains. It might have been somewhat mitigated, I suspect, if he had placed more emphasis on the apologetic context of the writers studied. It is true that the Christian use of the method was agressive. But it was demanded of their situation: as a *nova religio* the Christians could not enjoy the privileges of the *religiones licitae.* For Clement argument is a dangerous business, comparable with being a Chinese dissident today. The tools used are those supplied by the enemy himself, as the Numenian title of the monograph reminds us. In Eusebius we stand on the threshold of triumphalism, but an intellectual such as Porphyry is still an enemy who has to be taken very seriously. It is only when we reach Theodoret that the whole theme becomes a rather stale exercise—even the brief reign of Julian was two generations ago—and the aggressive tone begins to grate. In short we may conclude that the history of Patristic apologetics is a by no means exhausted subject. These two books have done much to increase our knowledge, but, as we indicated at the beginning of this review, there is still much left to do.

The third volume under review does not concern Patristic studies directly. We briefly mention it here because it has indirect links with the previous two volumes. It comes from the same Göteborg environment as the second monograph (in the preface Ridings notes that Göransson was his tutor). It deals with central aspects of the tradition of Middle Platonism that, as we saw, forms an important background for the treatise of ps.Justin. Written in an unusually trenchant and often witty style, this book is causing quite a splash in scholarly circles interested in the history of Platonism. For its motto we might take the following sentence on p. 23: "As matters stand, *nothing* that has been said . . . about Middle Platonism can be taken for granted without an unprejudiced testing of the evidence (his emphasis)."

The chief value of this study, in my opinion, is that it demonstrates how strongly our views on Middle Platonism have been formed by the theories

of 19th century scholars, esp. J. Freudenthal, H. Diels and Th. Sinko. These scholars put forward fragile hypotheses that readily won acceptance because they made such economical and effective use of the tiny amount of information that we have on the origin and development of the movement. According to Göransson all three were on the wrong track: the *Didaskalikos* of Alcinous has nothing to do with Albinus (as Giusta and Whittaker have already argued); Arius Didymus the doxographer is not to be identified with the Stoic court philosopher of Augustus (and it is more likely that he is dependent on Alcinous rather than the other way around); the entire hypothesis of a school of Gaius is nothing more than a fantasy. Seldom has a scholar shown such a sharp eye for the weaknesses of other scholars' arguments. He is particularly severe on the habitual tendency to slide from a "might be" to a "must be." From this point of view the critical method and tone of the study is like a breath of fresh air. But does our scholar adopt the same critical approach to his own arguments? This may in some cases be doubted. In particular I noted the tendency to move from a "probably is not" to a "must not be," e.g. in the case of the identity of Arius Didymus. When evidence is so scarce, probabilities are the name of the game. Every Patristic scholar with an interest in Middle Platonism should consult this book. It will captivate and instruct. But one must remain on one's guard.

NL-2333 AE *Leiden*, Rijnsburgerweg 116 D.T. Runia

Maximilian Krausgruber, *Die Regel des Eugippius. Die Klosterregel des Verfassers der Vita Sancti Severini im Lichte ihrer Quellen.* Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar (Frühes Christentum. Forschungen und Perspektiven. Publikationsreihe herausgegeben von Peter Hofrichter an der Katholisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Salzburg, Band 2), Salzburg, 1996, 318 S.

Im *Codex parisinus latinus* 12634 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale; wahrscheinlich gegen Ende des 6. Jh. geschrieben und bekannt als ältestes Zeugnis der *Regula Magistri*) befindet sich auch eine anonyme Klosterregel, die von Luc Verheijen (1967) und von Adalbert De Vogüé (1971) dem Eugippius zugeschrieben wurde. Wir wissen aus einer Mitteilung des Isidor von Sevilla, dass Eugippius eine Regel für die Mönche seines Severinklosters in Lucullanum verfasst hat. Wenn man ein anderes Werk des Eugippius, ein Augustinusflorilegium, mit der ganz aus Entlehnungen bestehenden anonymen Regel des *Codex parisinus* vergleicht, sieht man, wie De Vogüé ausführlich

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

dargelegt hat, dass die Arbeitsweise in beiden Werken eine Reihe von Ähnlichkeiten aufweist. Weiter gibt es Indizien, dass das *Commemoratorium Vitae Sancti Severini*, Eugippius' bekanntestes Werk, und die Regel sehr wohl von demselben Autor verfasst sein können. Die Häufung der Übereinstimmungen zwischen den beiden Werken macht Eugippius' Verfasserschaft der Regel sehr wahrscheinlich.

Die Einführung von Krausgrubers Arbeit informiert in klarer Weise unter anderem über diese Problematik der Zuschreibung, über den Verfasser und den Aufbau der *Regula Eugippii*. Bereits Augustin Genestout, der 1946 zuerst die Wichtigkeit des *Codex parisinus* für die *Regula Benedicti Regula Magistri*-Frage erkannt hatte, hat darauf hingewiesen, dass alle Texte, aus denen die jetzt dem Eugippius zugeschriebene Regel zusammengestellt ist, aus bekannten Werken stammen. Es handelt sich um 53 Exzerpte (mehr als ein Drittel aus der *Regula Magistri*, ein Siebtel aus Augustinus, ungefähr ebensoviel aus Cassianus, weiter grössere Teile aus Basilius und Novatus und schliesslich kurze Fragmente aus Pachomius, Hieronymus und der *Regula IV Patrum*). Die ganze Regel ist also aus bestehenden Texten aufgebaut, von denen einige vollständig übernommen worden sind: die an die Spitze gestellten Augustinustexte (*Ordo Monasterii* und *Praeceptum*) und die zwischen 430 und 530 geschriebene *Novati Sententia*.

Eugippius' Eingriffe in die ausgewählten Texte bleiben beschränkt. In den überschriften sind die meisten Eingriffe redaktionell bedingt, auch sind mehrere Überschriften bewusst in eine prägnantere Form gegossen. In einigen Fällen hat Eugippius im Text eine Verschärfung seiner Vorlage oder eine Verbesserung der Bibelzitate vorgenommen. Der Text der kritischen Ausgabe von F. Villegas und A. de Vogüé (CSEL 88,1976) ist der Übersetzung zugrunde gelegt worden. Dabei sind allerdings einige Stellen zu korrigieren: S. 90, Z. 23: *Zirca* = *Circa*; S. 118, Z. 23 *capita capita* = *capita*; S. 146, Z. 25 *retriebues* = *retribues*; S. 176, Z. 18 *humiliatis* = *humilitatis*; S. 192, Z. 29 *contradicitiones* = *contradictiones*; S. 210, Z. 13 *frates* = *fratres*. In einigen Fällen wäre eine Notiz über eine korrupt überlieferte Stelle im lateinischen Text nützlich gewesen. Jetzt ist man gezwungen, im kritischen Text von Villegas-De Vogüé nachzuschlagen, was sich hinter einem in der Regelhandschrift entstellten Wort versteckt. Allerdings weist auch der kritische Text Inkonsequenzen auf. So ist zwar 1,136 statt *moribus* (Hs.) das richtige *minoribus* in den Text aufgenommen worden und ebenso 38,3 *peccatoribus* statt *pectoribus*, wurde jedoch *conditur* der Regelhandschrift (42,14 = Hieronymus, *Ep.* 125,9) nicht durch das richtige *conliditur* ersetzt, das in den kritischen Apparat verbannt wurde. Wenn man die kritische Ausgabe

nicht zu Rate zieht, bleibt unklar, dass hinter *eligatur* (S. 178, Z. 14) eigentlich *elidatur* steckt. Eine derartige Unklarheit ist bisweilen auch nicht ohne Konsequenzen für die deutsche Übersetzung geblieben.

Die Übersetzung der Eugippiusregel ist die erste in deutscher Sprache (mehrere der verwendeten Texte sind allerdings schon früher übersetzt worden). Die Übersetzung will dem Original nahe bleiben. Sie ist treu, aber nicht ganz makellos, wie folgende Beispiele zeigen: S. 140, Z. 18 *mentiri deo per tonsuram noscuntur*: "man erkennt, wie sie Gott durch die Tonsur belügen" (statt: "Sie . . . wissen Gott durch die Tonsur zu belügen"); S. 146, Z. 5-7 *dum adhuc et in hoc corpore sumus et haec omnia per hanc lucis uitam (= per uitam in hac luce) uacat implere*: "solange wir noch in diesem Körper sind und es Zeit ist, das alles zu erfüllen, während wir hier das Lebenslicht schauen" (statt: "solange wir hier und in diesem Körper sind und es Zeit ist, das alles für dieses Leben des Lichtes zu erfüllen"); S. 162, Z. 6-7 *reum se . . . de peccatis suis existimet*: "er halte sich . . . wegen seiner Sünden für schuldig" (statt: "er hält sich" usw.); S. 180, Z. 4-5 *uelut expertum ignarum* (Cassianus: *uelut inexpertum ignarumque*) ist nicht übersetzt worden; S. 188, Z. 11-12 *tradens . . . semetipsum uoluntarie satanae*: "er übergibt sich . . . freiwillig Satan" (statt: "übergibt . . . sich selbst dem Willen Satans"); S. 188, Z. 24 *ueniabilis mora sit*: "sei die Verspätung zu verzeihen" (statt: "Aufschub . . . um zu kommen"; vgl. Z. 30-31 *tarditatis impetret ueniam*); S. 194, Z. 16 *per fratrum obsequia ministratur*: "durch die Dienste der Brüder angeboten wird" (statt: "für die Nachgiebigkeit der Brüder dient"; S. 212, Z. 13 *alienos seruos* (vgl. *Röm.* 14,4): "die Knechte eines andern" (statt: "die anderen Knechte"); S. 212, Z. 15 *nullum ueretur*: "vor niemandem hat er Achtung" (statt: "Nichts fürchtet er").

Mit Recht betont M. Krausgruber, dass die von Eugippius getroffene Wahl für ihn charakteristisch und illustrativ ist. In der von Eugippius' Regel gemachten Analyse (S. 255ff.) werden weiter die wichtigen Themen klar hervorgehoben.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. BARTELINK

Petri Callinicensis patriarchae Antiocheni tractatus contra Damianum. II. Libri tertii capita i-xix ediderunt et anglice reddiderunt R.Y. Ebied, A. Van Roey, L.R. Wickham (= *Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca* 32). Turnhout-Leuven, 1996. LVI, 568 p.

Lorsque nous avons présenté, dans cette revue même (t. 49 [1995], p. 202-204), l'édition du deuxième livre du *Contra Damianum* de Pierre de Callinique (= *Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca* 29 [Turnhout-Leuven, 1994]), nous avons eu l'occasion d'esquisser l'enjeu et le déroulement de la controverse trinitaire entre les patriarches Damien d'Alexandrie et Pierre d'Antioche (dernier quart du VI^{e} siècle). Il suffira donc de rappeler ici que, pour faire face au trithéisme, Damien avait minimalisé l'existence des personnes du Père, du Fils et du Saint-Esprit, au point de réduire les hypostases à leurs propriétés caractéristiques, à savoir, respectivement l'ingénération, la génération et la procession. Pierre avertit son collègue de l'erreur manifeste qu'il était en train de commettre, mais Damien s'en offensa et les deux hommes engagèrent une polémique de plus en plus venimeuse. Une ancienne traduction syriaque nous a conservé une grande partie de l'ouvrage principal de Pierre, le *Contra Damianum.*

Le troisième et dernier livre de cet écrit est divisé en 50 chapitres; l'ensemble étant particulièrement long, les éditeurs ont prévu trois volumes, dont celui qui vient de paraître et qui est consacré aux chap. i-xix. Pour reconstituer le texte syriaque de ce troisième livre, on dispose de six manuscrits (*British Library Add. MSS* 7191, 7192 et 14603; *Vat. syr.* 107 et 108; *Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Sachau* 201) et de deux florilèges dogmatiques offrant d'importants extraits repris à la traduction syriaque. Mais le nombre des manuscrits, en réalité, se réduit à quatre, les éditeurs ayant découvert que les sections concernées de l'*Add.* 14603 et du *Vat. syr.* 107 d'une part, et celles de l'*Add.* 7192 et du *Sachau* 201 d'autre part, constituaient à l'origine chaque fois un seul volume. Les chapitres aujourd'hui édités contiennent surtout la réfutation des arguments avancés par Damien dans sa *Longue lettre* (*Epistula prolixa*), mais au chap. xix, Pierre s'en prend également aux *Lettres festales* des années 586 et 587. Procédant systématiquement, Pierre cite les textes où Damien s'exprime avec le plus de netteté, puis, moyennant une analyse méticuleuse, il les réfute. Grâce à ces citations, on voit très bien dans le livre III que l'erreur de Damien a été causée par une mauvaise interprétation des Pères, là où ceux-ci, dans leur discours trinitaire, désignaient les personnes divines tantôt par le terme "hypostases", tantôt par le terme "propriétés" (ἰδιότητες). Le patriarche

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

d'Alexandrie a identifié les deux notions, et Pierre s'est ingénié à montrer qu'il a confondu ainsi les mots et les réalités. Les deux parties accordent une grande importance à l'argument patristique. Malgré les efforts qui ont été faits pour les identifier, quelques-uns des *testimonia* semblent inconnus par ailleurs (il s'agit de pièces d'Amphiloque d'Iconium, de Basile de Césarée, du pape Libère, de Pierre de Callinique et de Sévèred' Antioche); le jour où cette belle édition du *Contra Damianum* sera achevée, on devra examiner si ces pièces nouvelles sont toutes authentiques.

B-9000 *Gent*, Vaderlandstraat 30 José DECLERCK

Le Livre de Job chez les Pères. Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 5. Centre d'analyse et documentation patristiques, Strassbourg, 1996.

J. Doignon, "Rengaines" origéniennes dans les *Homélies sur Job* d'Hilaire de Poitiers; J. Doignon, Versets de *Job* sur le péché de notre origine selon Hilaire de Poitiers; P. Maraval, Job dans l'œuvre de Zénon de Vérone; D. Doucet, Job: l'Église et la tribulation. Augustin, *Adnotationes in Job* 29-31; C. Fournier, Augustin, *Adnotationes in Job* 29-31. Traduction; L. Brottier, L'actualisation de la figure de Job chez Chrysostome; J.-N. Guinot, Regard sur l'utilisation du *Livre de Job* dans l'œuvre de Théodoret de Cyr; C. Renoux, La chaîne arménienne sur le *livre de Job*; F. Vinel, *Job* 38: le commentaire de Julien l'arien et les interprétations cappadociennes; R. Gounelle, Le frémissement des portiers de l'Enfer à la vue du Christ. *Job* 38,17b et les trois symboles de foi des années 359-360; D.A. Bertrand, Le bestiaire de *Job*. Notes sur les versions grecques et latines. Index des noms d'animaux, Index biblique.

J.N. Bremmer (Ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of John.* Kok Pharos Publishing House, Kampen, 1995.

A. Hilhorst, The Apocryphal Acts as Martyrdom Texts: the case of the *Acts of Andrew*; K. Bolyki, Miracle Stories in the *Acts of John*; J. Bremmer, Women in the Apocryphal *Acts of John*; I. Karasszon, Old Testament Quotations in the Apocryphal Acts; J. Roldanus, Die Eucharistie in den Johannesakten; P.J. Lalleman, Polymorphy of Christ; G. Luttikhuizen, A Gnostic Reading of the *Acts of John*; P. Herceg, Sermons in the *Acts of John*; T. Adamik, The Influence of the Apocryphal Acts on Jerome's *Lives of Saints*; R.H. Bremmer, Jr., The Reception of the *Acts of John* in Anglo-

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Saxon England; G. Jenkins, Papyrus I from Kellis. A Greek Text with Affinities to the *Acts of John*; P.J. Lalleman, Bibliography of *Acts of John*. Index of names, subjects and passages. Plates.

Alois van Tongerloo (in collaboration with Johannes van Oort) (Edd.), The Manichaean ΝΟΥΣ. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized in Louvain from 31 July to 3 August 1991. (Manichaean Studies II). Lovanii, 1995.

K. Rudolph, Einleitende Bemerkungen zur manichäischen Vorstellung vom νοῦς; U. Bianchi, Concerning the νοῦς in Gnosticism; A. Böhlig, Zum griechischen Hintergrund der Manichäischen νοῦς-Metaphysik; P. Bryder, Sailboats in the Moonlight; L. Cirillo, The νοῦς in the "Corpus Paulinum"; C. Colpe, Die Zergliederung des νοῦς. Vorstufen manichäischer Systembildung im Mittleren Platonismus; D. de Smet, La fonction du νοῦς dans le système religieux des Druzes: une synthèse entre ismaélisme et gulūw; E. Feldmann, Der Übertritt Augustins zu den Manichäern; I. Gardner, An abbreviated Version of Medinet Madi Psalm LXVIII found at Kellis: A/5/53B (Folio 4, Text A2); C. Giuffré-Scibona. Funzione, denominazioni, carattere del νοῦς nelle opere antimanichee di Agostino; J. Helderman, The Hermetic νοῦς in the oldest European work on Coptic; H.-J. Klimkeit, Der Licht-νοῦς im Korpus des uigurischen Manichaica; Lin Wushu, The Original Manuscript of a Chinese Manichaean Hymnal; P.A. Mirecki, A Hymn to the Light-νοῦς in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book; P.A. Mirecki, The νοῦς in the Greek and Coptic Magical Papyri; G. Quispel, Hermes Trismegistos and Mani; L. Rizzerio, Aspects de l'évolution de la notion de νοῦς dans la philosophie grecque jusqu'à Clément d'Alexandrie; W. Sundermann, Who is the Light-νοῦς and what does he do?; P. Van Lindt, The Light-νοῦς in the Coptic Manichaean Documents; J. van Oort, Augustinus und der Manichäismus; A. van Tongerloo, Reflections on the Manichaean νοῦς. Index.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The inclusion of a book in this list, which contains all books received by the editors, does not guarantee its subsequent review.

Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits Grecs de Marcel Richard. Troisième édition entièrement refondue par Jean-Marie Olivier (Corpus Christianorum). Turnhout, Brepols, 1995. XVI, 952 p.

Ascensio Isaiae. Vol. I Textus cura Paolo Bettiolo, Alda Giambelluca Kossova, Claudio Leonardi, Enrico Norelli, Lorenzo Perrone; Vol. II Commentarius, cura Enrico Norelli (Corpus Christianorum. Series Apocryphorum, 7 en 8). Turnhout, Brepols, 1995. XXXI, 444 et 722 p.

Paul Corby Finney, The Invisible God. The Earliest Christians on Art. New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1994. XXVIII, 319 p.

R. Dean Anderson Jr., Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul. Kok Pharos Publishing House, P.O. Box 5016, 8260 GA Kampen, 1996. 315 p.

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 22 Epistula ad Corinthios I 2. Lieferung. Einleitung (Fortsetzung). Herausgegeben von Uwe Fröhlich. Freiburg, Herder, 1996.

Hermann Josef Frede, Vetus Latina—Fragmente zum Alten Testament. Die pelagianische epistula ad quandam matronam christianam. In Zusammenarbeit mit U. Fröhlich und H. Stanjik. Freiburg, Herder, 1996.

Giacomo Raspanti, Mario Vittorino esegeta di S. Paulo. Prefazioni da Yves Marie Duval (Biblioteca philologica 1). L'epos società editrice, Palermo, Via Cluverio 10. 1996. 179 p.

La Livre de Job chez les Pères. Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 5. Centre d'analyse et de documentation patristiques, Strasbourg, 1996 (onze articles).

Nag Hammadi Codex VII. Edited by Birger A. Pearson. Contributors: F. Wisse, G.J. Riley, H. Desjardins, J. Brashler, M. Peel, J. Zandee, J.E. Goehring, J.M. Robinson, C. Jefford, B.H. Pearson (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 30). E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln. 1996. XXVIII, 479 p.

H. Jacobson, A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. With Latin Text and English Translation (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 31). 2 volumes. E.J. Brill, London-New York-Köln, 1996. 1307 p.

Alcimi Aviti, De mundi initio. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento a cura de Luca Morisi. Pàtron Editiore, Bologna, 1996. 146 p. L. 19.000.

Origène, Homélies sur les Nombres I (Homélies I-X). Texte latin de W.A. Baehrens (GCS). Nouvelle édition par Louis Doutreleau, s.j. d'après l'édition d'André Méhat et les notes de Marcel Borret, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 415). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 327 p. 191 F.

Grégoire de Nysse, Homélies sur l'Ecclésiaste. Texte grec de l'édition P. Alexander. Introduction, traduction notes et index par Françoise Vinel (Sources Chrétiennes 416). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 446 p. 298 F.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Roberto Radice, La "Metafisica" di Aristotele nel XX secolo. Bibliografia ragionata e sistematica. Con la collaborazione di 41 autore. Presentazione de Giovanni Reale. Vita e Pensiero, Milano, 1996. 735 p. L 75.000.

Guy G. Stroumsa, Hidden Wisdom. Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism (Studies in the History of Religions 70). Leiden-New York-Köln, E.J. Brill, 1996. XII, 183 p.

Matthias Klinghardt, Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern (Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 13). Francke Verlag, Tübingen-Basel, 1996. XII, 633 S. DM 126,—/öS 920/SFr 113,—.

Maximilian Krausgrüber O. Cist., Die Regel des Eugippius. Die Klosterordnung des Verfassers der Vita Sancti Severini im Lichte ihrer Quellen. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar (Frühes Christentum. Forschungen und Perspektiven 2). Thaur bei Innsbruck, Kulturverlag, 1996. XV, 318 S. DM 42,—/öS 298,—.

John Oommen Madathil, Kosmas der Indienfahrer. Kaufmann, Kosmologe und Exeget zwischen alexandriner und antiochener Theologie (Frühes Christentum. Forschungen u. Perspektiven 4). Thaur, Kulturverlag, 1996. 213 S. DM 34,—/ös 248.

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 11/2 Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) 6. Lieferung Sir 11,35-16,21. Herausgegeben von Walther Thiele. Freiburg, Herder, 1996.

Vetus Latina, Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 12 (Pars II) Esaias, Fasc. 7 Is 53,3-54,17, edidit Roger Gryson. Freiburg, Herder, 1996.

Karen L. King, Revelation of the Unknowable God. With Text, Translation and Notes to NHC XI,3 Allogenes (California Classical Library). Polebridge, Santa Rosa, 1995. VIII, 215 p.

Karin Alt, Gott, Götter und Seele bei Alkinoos. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Franz Steinerverlag, Stuttgart, 1996. 46 S.

R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (edd.), Exploring the Gospel of John. In honor of Moody Smith. Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1996. XXXIV, 409 p. $42.00.

Ronald F. Hock, The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas, with Introduction, Notes, and Original Text featuring the NEW Scholars Version Translation. Polebridge Press, P.O. Box 6144 Santa Rosa CA 95406, 1995. 158 p.

Maurice Wiles, Archetypal Heresay. Arianism through the Centuries. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996. 204 p. £30.00.

Alois van Tongerloo (ed. in collaboration with Johannes van Oort), The Manichaean NOYΣ. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized in Louvain from 31 July to 3 August 1991 (Manichaean Studies II). Lovanii, 1995. 323 p.

Antti Marjanen, The Woman Jesus Loved. Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 40). Leiden-New York-Köln, Brill, 1996. XI, 261 p.

Gabino Uríbarri Bilbao, Monarquia y Trinidad. El concepto teológico "Monarchia" en la controversia "Monarquiana." Universidad Pontificia Camillas, Madrid, 1996. XXV, 588 p.

Kate Cooper, The Virgin and the Bride. Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity. Harvard University Press, 1996. £24.95.

Caroline P. Hammond Bammel, Origeniana et Rufiniana (Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 29). Freiburg, Herder, 1996.

Johannes van Oort, Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine. The Rediscovery of Manichaeism

and Its Influence on Western Christianity. Lectures delivered at the State University of Tbilisi and the K. Kekelidze Institute of Manuscripts of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi, Georgia, 26-29 September, 1995. Tbilisi, 1996. (Also obtainable at the Theological Faculty of the University of Utrecht, P.O. Box 80.105, 3508 TC Utrecht.)

David G. Horrell, The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence. Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement. Edinburgh T&T Clark, 1996. XVI, 395 p.

Majella Franzmann, Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1996. XXV, 293 p.

TO THE READERS

We have to announce some changes in the board of editors-in-chief. Two eminent scholars have taken their leave after a long and fruitful period of editorial activities.

Professor G. Quispel, one of the founders of this review, served on the board for 50 years, in particular as an expert of Gnosticism. Studies in this field have always belonged to the scope of *Vigiliae Christianae* and it is our firm intention to continue this policy. Professor A.F.J. Klijn, who joined the board in 1977, occupied himself specifically with the earliest phase of Christianity and the New Testament apocrypha. This domain is, of course, equally indispensable to our review. We are greatly indebted to both emeriti for their generous cooperation.

Dr. D.T. Runia, professor of ancient and patristic philosophy at the University of Leiden and an expert in Philonic studies, has become a member of the board, which in the near future will probably be joined by another new editor-in-chief.

J. DEN BOEFT
J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF POLYCARP *PHILIPPIANS* 11.3

BY

MICHAEL W. HOLMES

By common consent one of the most difficult clauses in Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians*[1] occurs in 11.3, which reads (in part) as follows:

> (a) But I have not observed or heard of any such thing among you, (b) in whose midst the blessed Paul labored, (c) *qui estis in principio epistulae eius*, (d) for he boasts about you in all the churches . . .

The problem is in clause (c), the phrase *qui estis in principio epistulae eius* (perhaps "who are in the beginning of his letter"); something appears to have been lost or garbled either in translation or transmission.[2] A number of attempts have been made either to interpret the phrase as it stands or to rectify it via emendation; in the following list the first two construe the phrase as it has been transmitted, while the rest propose emendations of one sort or another.[3]

1) "who in the beginning (*of the Gospel*) were his letters (*of commendation*)."[4]
2) "who are *mentioned* in the beginning of his epistle."[5]
3) "who were *praised* [*laudati*] in the beginning of his letter."[6]
4) "who are in the beginning his *church*," *qui estis in principio ecclesia eius*.[7]
5) "who were in the beginning of the *gospel*."[8]
6) "who were in the beginning of his *apostolate*."[9]

The following emendation understands Paul, rather than the Philippians, as the antecedent of the clause:

7) "who *testifies* in the beginning of his letter."[10]

In assessing these various proposals, it may be granted that Volkmar's proposal (#7) is ingenious, but perhaps overly complex; moreover, it appears that Paul does not become the focus of Polycarp's attention until clause (d), and that Polycarp usually supplies the object of his verbs (cf. the following "boasts about you").[11] Against #1 (and, to a lesser extent, #2) is the observation that it is unlike Polycarp either to leave verbs unexpressed or to require his readers to infer so much of his train of thought.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 207-210

GREGORY OF NYSSA AND THE NEOPLATONIC DOCTRINE OF THE SOUL

BY

ENRICO PEROLI

I. *Introduction*

In her work *Rhetorik und Theologie*, Henriette M. Meissner offered a first exhaustive analysis of both the total structure and the argumentative procedure in the *De anima et resurrectione*:[1] in so doing, she fully succeeded in her aim[2] of giving a more satisfactory starting point for a better understanding of the philosophical and theological contents of one of the most thoughtful works Gregory of Nyssa ever wrote, and surely one of the most meaningful as regards the relations with the philosophical tradition of his time. In her discussion of the introductive part of the work, Meissner clearly pointed out, among other things, that the *De anima et resurrectione* falls within the literary genre of "consolatio";[3] more exactly, this dialogue between Gregory and his dying sister Macrina resembles, from the beginning, a "consolatio mortis" based on a λόγος περὶ ψυχῆς. It is by such a "logos," in fact, that Macrina[4] would lead Gregory, and with him the reader, to overcome fear in the face of death, showing the rational grounds of Christian hope in an eschatological future, in opposition to any materialistic view that encloses man within the horizon of earthly life through the affirmation of the perishable nature of the soul. Just so, the prologue of the *De anima et resurrectione* opens with Gregory plagued by profound "pathos" at the sight of his dying sister and ends with a discussion on the nature of the soul and on its immortality (ἡ περὶ τοῦ διαμένειν τὴν ψυχὴν δόξα, 17 C): from the beginning the lack of a ἀκριβὴς ἐπιστήμη on man's destiny after death emerges as the first cause of every "pathos"[5] and lack of hope.

The criterion that the Christian hope relates to, as regards death, is not however only the immortality of the soul, according to the Platonic view, but the resurrection of man as a whole: soul and body. For this reason, the δόγμα περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς referred to in the first part of the dialogue ("de anima") becomes the starting point and, at the same time, the presuppo-

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

sition for a quest ("de resurrectione") that, in the face of the pagan objections and also those doubts suffered by a believer, sets out to delineate, following a rigorous argument (ἐξ ἀκολουθίας, 108 A), how the Christian faith in the resurrection of the body is by no means alien to rational credibility. It thus remains open to an understanding based on philosophical principles. It is in this very connection between the λόγος περὶ ψυχῆς and the λόγος περὶ ἀναστάσεως that, as Meissner points out,[6] the true novelty of the *De anima et resurrectione* of Gregory of Nyssa resides.

Therefore, within this unitary and clearly Christian *skopos* of the dialogue[7] Gregory deals with a subject (that of the soul) which had played a leading rôle in the philosophy of the Hellenistic and Imperial age.[8] The discussion on this subject, the fundamental concepts of which caused the divergences in opinion among the various philosophical schools,[9] had come to centre on a set of "quaestiones" that, from the second century onwards, relying on a doxographic material widely spread and utilized, formed the traditional outline of treatises about the soul.[10] It is just this outline which formed the route along which Gregory himself travelled in the ζήτησις about the soul which is presented in *De anima et resurrectione*.[11]

We have had elsewhere[12] the opportunity to consider in detail the "quaestiones de anima" that Gregory of Nyssa deals with in the course of the dialogue, and to insert them in the context of his thought, on one hand, and in that of the philosophical tradition of the Imperial age, on the other. From this comparison, from the analysis of the discussions in the philosophical "milieu" of that age, from the ideas which Gregory receives and from the way he transforms them, there emerge some essential elements for the understanding of his anthropology and, more generally, of his philosophical and theological thought. For it is well known that the theme of the soul had always concealed the key to the solution of problems of greater importance. Our aim here is to look more closely to the link that, as we said, Gregory of Nyssa establishes between the λόγος περὶ ψυχῆς and the λόγος περὶ ἀναστάσεως, in order to single out the characteristics and the philosophical sources of the soul doctrine set forth in *De anima et resurrectione*.

II. *The Doctrine of Resurrection in the Discussion between Platonism and Christianity*

It is well known that the dogma of the resurrection had always been, since St. Paul's speech at Areopagus, one of the fundamental themes in the debate between Platonism and Christianity.[13] As a matter of fact, for

the pagan world, and particularly for those pagans who follow Platonic teachings, the doctrine of resurrection was one of the biggest impediments before adopting the Christian message. And this is easily understandable. According to the Platonic view of the world, the aim of man's spiritual life consists in a progressive liberation from the body and from multiplicity;[14] καθ' ἑαυτὴν γενέσθαι: this is the task of the soul formulated by Plato in the *Phaedo*,[15] with which the entire Platonic tradition agreed. In order to come to itself and into itself, the soul has to free itself from the bond with the corporality and to the tangible dimension connected with this corporality; this latter makes the soul live not inside itself but outside, like in a "dream,"[16] or as if it were "drunk":[17] it does not allow the soul to exercise fully that spiritual activity that is in conformity with its essence, and by which it can attain the true Being. Being inside itself, however, the soul is at the same time present with the first Principle that is transcendent, and that is generally marked by Plato by αὐτὰ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ὄντα; for like recognizes like. Therefore, in this life the philosophical activity has to be already thought of as a liberation from the body and as a practice for death;[18] it anticipates that eschatological view towards which the hope of the philosopher inclines, that is the state where the soul, completely free from the body, can fully exercise its proper cognitive activity and opens itself to the contemplation of the true Reality.[19]

Hence, it is clear that the idea of the resurrection of the whole man, including his body, is from the Platonic point of view quite nonsensical. It would mean the prolongation even after death of that estranged state that the soul experiences in its earthly condition; this is to say that the soul would never arrive at the contemplation of the Divine and the further step of merging itself with it. This is the meaning of Plotinus' words: "the true wakening is a true getting up from the body, not with the body":[20] ἀπὸ σώματος, οὐ μετά σώματος ἀνάστασις, because "getting up with the body" would only mean "getting out (μετάστασις) of one sleep into another."[21] The true "awakening"[22] is just the same as the cognitive and ethical abstraction process (ἀφαίρεσις) and purification (κάθαρσις) from the sensible and corporeal, through which the soul, wakening the divine Principle that has always been inside itself, lives "according to the Nous,"[23] and therefore sees what the Nous itself sees, the Ideas and the One.[24]

Moreover, for Platonism, in each stage of its historical development, it was always unthinkable to accept that which, given the horizon opened up by Christianity, amounts to the true foundation of the faith in the resurrection of the dead: the incarnation of the *Logos*. The Logos, in fact,

where every truth and knowledge resides, is unchangeable: the truth is eternally identical with itself. Any development in the revelation of the truth must therefore be excluded; if there is a revelation, it is eternal just as the Logos itself.[25] This excludes the need for salvation by Divine intervention throughout history and for a new revelation. The Godhead, in its providence, has revealed, since early times,[26] everything that mankind needs to reach his salvation, and has thus provided them with the ability to grasp the Logos that works around them by the logos they have inside themselves.

The sphere of this original revelation is first of all the *cosmos*: the tangible universe is a *theophania*, a revelation of the divine world to men.[27] By the action of the World-Soul,[28] it becomes the image of the Intelligible, the manifestation of the Logos (Nous)[29] and, last, of its Principle, the One.[30] This ordering action establishes from the beginning and preserves (σῴζειν) providentially the identity of each being, assigning to it the place which belongs to it in the Whole, and founding in this way its *soteria*.[31] For this reason, the world does not need any Incarnation, as it has always been "saved."[32]

It is on the ground of this theological-cosmological view, where the heritage of the philosophical Greek tradition is brought to full realization and in which certain central ideas, particularly the Stoic conception of Logos as "legality" and cosmic providence,[33] are further developed, that Porphyry, like Celsus, rejects the Christian doctrine of resurrection.[34] We arrive here at one of the points where Platonism and Christianity seem to contrast in an irreconcilable way.[35]

With this debate between Platonism and Christianity, one of the most important problems pointed out by pagan thinkers referred to the state of the resurrected body and to the identity of this latter with the earthly body. In relation to this problem pagan thinkers had raised a series of difficulties which were intended to dispute or mock the faith in the resurrection.[36] These difficulties were incidentally observed even within the Christian ambit, and, as it is well known, were referred to by Origen.[37] In *De anima et resurrectione*, Gregory makes himself the spokesman of pagan objections (76 C, 108 C), by requesting his sister Macrina to offer, in face of such objections, a defence of the resurrection also on a philosophical level, pointing out, so to speak, its rational credibility.[38] In order to give such a justification, Macrina expounds a doctrine of the soul regarding particularly the properties of the intelligible nature to which the soul belongs. In so doing she intends to resolve the difficulties posed by the pagans concerning corpo-

real resurrection. For this reason, in *De an.*, 76 D, after repeating once again the pagan objections (76 C), Gregory can refer to the doctrine his sister Macrina had previously expounded: "Therefore, such an opinion about the soul would be a sufficient rebuttal to this objection." It is this doctrine we now have to consider.

III. *The Nature of the Soul and the Resurrection Doctrine*

The subject of resurrection is explicitly put in the centre of discussion in *De anima et resurrectione* by an objection Gregory raises towards his sister Macrina, in response to her assertion of the substantiality and the immateriality of the soul in the refutation of the Stoic and Epicurean materialistic doctrine:

"No one disputes the fact that the elements come together and are separated from each other and that there is a constitution and dissolution of the body. However, since it is known that there is a great deal of difference between each of these elements, which are heterogeneous among themselves, depending on their position and their qualitative differences and peculiarities, inasmuch as these elements come together in subjection to each other, it follows that this intellectual and undimensional nature which we call the soul must be attached to what it was yoked to. But if these are separated and go off wherever the nature of each takes it, what will happen to the soul once its vehicle is dispersed on all sides? Like a sailor whose vessel has been destroyed in a shipwreck [. . .], in the same way the soul, not being prepared by nature to go in separate ways when the elements separate, if it is reluctant to be separated from the body and clings entirely to one of the elements, it will be separated from the others and the sequence of the argument does not lead us to consider it immortal on account of its existing in one any more than to think it mortal on account of its not existing in many."[39]

In such a way, we find here one of the main criticisms that pagan thinkers posed against the Christian doctrine of resurrection, with special regard to the condition of the resurrected body: that is how is it possible to think that the soul, at the time of resurrection, restores, in its original form,[40] the body which belonged to it during its lifetime, once the elements of the compound being returned, after the dissolution, to the corresponding elements of the All, that is to their "natural place"?[41] "The intelligible and undimensional (τὸ νοητόν τε καὶ ἀδιάτατον) does not contract and expand. In accordance with its own nature, invisible and incorporeal,

it is present equally at the joining and separating of the elements in the body."[42]

We have here the first element of Macrina's reply: the intelligible natures are not subject to the laws of spatial dimensionality. The intelligible is *adiastaton*. So it does not contract (συστέλλεται), neither expand (διαχεῖται) like bodies. Moreover, being *adiastaton*, the intelligible, in its union with the sensible, escapes the principle of the natural order of the elements. To this principle, particularly used by Porphyry in his criticism of the Christian doctrine of resurrection,[43] Macrina clearly refers a little later: "There is, indeed, much difference between that which is light and goes upwards and the heavy and the earthy, between the hot and the cold, the moist and its opposite."[44] According to the principle *de ordine elementorum*, each element occupies, because of its nature, an *oikeios topos*. For this reason, Macrina asserts that, with the dissolution of the bodily compound, its constitutive elements, returned to "the elements related to themselves by nature," are very distant in space,[45] since they are separated because of heterogeneity of their qualities. It looks as if this remark introduces a further difficulty. Gregory had already referred to this difficulty when he remarked that the soul will only be able to attach itself to one of its bodily elements, the one which happens to be closer at hand.[46]

The introduction of the notion of *adiastaton* seeks to solve this difficulty. Unlike physical natures, the intelligible, even when joined to the sensible, is not subjected to the law of the *oikeios topos*. After a few pages, during a digression about the localization of Hades, Macrina points out that the problem of the location has no significance in relation to the soul. For, unlike bodies, "the soul is not required (μήδεμιαν ἀνάγκην) by nature to be contained in one place."[47] Therefore, the intelligible nature transcends any idea concerning place or space. In this way Macrina can solve the problem: for the intelligible nature, being *adiastatos*, "it is no trouble to be present in each element, since it is not affected by their opposition; for, while these are thought to be apart from each other, depending on their position and qualities, the undimensional nature (ἡ ἀδιάστατος φύσις) does not suffer to being joined to things that are apart";[48] the soul "is not shut in by conjunction of the elements or abandoned when the elements go off to those related to them by nature, even if there is a great difference to be observed in the heterogeneity of the elements."[49]

In order to illustrate how the intelligible nature is not circumscribed by any space limit, Macrina presents the example of the theoretical faculty of the soul: "Even now, it is possible to contemplate the sky in our thought and to reach the boundaries of the universe in our curiosity, and the con-

templative faculty of our soul is not distended by such distances."[50]

This idea of ubiquity of the soul is a very ancient doctrine,[51] that was widely dispersed during the Hellenistic age.[52] But while inside the traditional conception, as for example we find still in Philo,[53] the ubiquity of the soul is meant in the sense that the soul, that is οὐσίᾳ in the body, yet it is δυνάμει everywhere, for Gregory, as M. Pellegrino has already pointed out,[54] it means that the soul transcends, as does its intelligible *ousia*, any category connected with space.

Another factor is indeed added here: the character of singleness of the intelligible nature. Being simple (ἁπλοῦν) and uncompounded (ἀσύνθετον), the intelligible exists in any element it unites with in a unitary and undivided way. The example Macrina gives is that of the *techne*: in the melting process, for instance, when matter is divided the *techne* does not break into parts along with matter: for the indivisible cannot be divided.[55] The same is true for the intelligible and undimensional nature of the soul (ἡ νοερά τε καὶ ἀδιάστατος φύσις): being simple and uncompounded, it is present in a unitary and undivided way in any element of the body, both when they are mingled to form the compound and when, after death, they are separated one from the other. It does not break into parts (εἰς μέρη) according to the number of elements, but it remains (μένει) as a whole in any of these elements;[56] therefore, "also when the composite body is dissolved and goes back into its individual parts, it is not at all unreasonable to think that the simple and uncomposite nature (τὴν ἁπλῆν ἐκείνην καὶ ἀσύνθετον φύσιν) is present in each of the parts even after the dissolution, and that, once joined to the composite elements through some ineffable logic, it remains always with these elements with which it was mingled and is, in no way, severed from the union in which it once existed. For when the composite is dissolved, the uncomposite runs no risk of being dissolved with it."[57]

The first point to be emphasized is the rôle that the notion of *diastema* plays in Macrina's argumentation. The *diastema*, that is the space-time dimension, seems to be the distinctive feature of physical, sensible reality; this is defined as σωματικὴ καὶ διαστηματικὴ φύσις,[58] as διαστηματικόν τε καὶ σύνθετον.[59] On the contrary, the intelligible nature, to which the soul belongs, is not subjected to the space dimension, to any *diastasis*: 45 C: τὸ νοητόν τε καὶ ἀδιάστατον; 48 A: ἡ δὲ νοηρά τε καὶ ἀδιάστατος φύσις τὰ ἐκ διαστάσεως οὐκ ἀναδέχεται πάθη. In the same way, in *Apologia in Hexaemeron* the intelligible nature, in opposition to the physical one, it is said to be καθαρὰ τῶν τοπικῶν τε καὶ διαστηματικῶν ἰδιωμάτων.[60]

The notion of *diastema* is, as it is well known, one of the basic themes

of Gregorian thought.[61] But, as P. Zemp pointed out,[62] *De anima et resurrectione*, just as *Apologia in Hexaemeron*, still represents the first stage in the elaboration of this concept. From *Contra Eunomium* onwards, the concept of *diastema* is extended to the whole of Creation, both sensible and intelligible.[63] In such a way, the *diastema* becomes an ontological concept which indicates the *finitudo* of the being *qua* created.[64] In this way, the intelligible Creation, that is the hypercosmos of the angelic natures, to which the soul belongs, is not alien to the διαστηματικὴ φύσις. The *diastema* comes to denote the infinite distance that divides the whole of Creation, sensible and intelligible, from the infinite God. For only in relation to God any *diastasis* is excluded.[65]

In the light of such a specification, it is surely meaningful, for the problem we are dealing with, that, in the context we have outlined above—where Gregory works on the ground of Platonic contraposition between sensible (bodily reality, that is compounded and therefore perishable) and intelligible (immaterial nature, that is simple and therefore imperishable)—, the character of *adiastatos physis* is ascribed to the soul; in this way, the transcendence of the soul is stated, in the most manifest way, as regards to everything which belongs to the physical sphere and which is subject to its laws. Such laws can not affect the intelligible, even when it joins with the sensible: it remains *apathes*.[66] The way the intelligible joins with the sensible is, indeed, irreducible to any kind of union between physical realities. It is on the ground of this view that Gregory intends to answer to the pagan objections concerning the resurrection.

There is a passage in *De hominis opificio* where we find this view clearly delineated. The context is however different. For Gregory is not concerned with the resurrection, but with the problem of the "place" of the *hegemonikon*. This is one of the "quaestiones" which fell within the traditional doxographic scheme about the soul.[67] Two schools faced each other: the Platonic school, which placed the *hegemonikon* inside the head,[68] and the Stoic school, which placed its seat inside the heart.[69] Gregory rejects both solutions: for the uncorporeal nature cannot be circumscribed by space delimitations (τοπικαῖς τισι περιγραφαῖς).[70] Gregory dwells for a long time upon the connections between physiological processes and soul activities. These interrelations cannot however be explained by placing the nous inside a specific part of the body.[71] Spatial location fits only the physical realities.[72] The psycho-somatic unity of man, shown by the connections between the physical processes and the soul activities, cannot explain how the soul is joined to the body. That kind of union between an intelligible and spir-

itual nature, such as the soul, and a corporeal and material reality, such as the body, is profoundly different from any union between physical realities. It is therefore irreducible to the categories of the material world: the presence of the soul "inside" the body has no "localized" character; the soul is not inside (ἐντός) the body as in a vase; the uncorporeal, as we said, can not be limited in space.[73] Hence the character of incomprehensibility and inexpressibility of this union on which Gregory insists: the κοινώνια of the *nous* with the body is ἄφραστόν τε καὶ ἀνεπινόητον (177 B; κατὰ τὸν ἄφραστον λόγον, 160 D), ἀμήχανόν τε καὶ ἀκατονόητον (177 C). In the same way, in *De anima et resurrectione* the simple and uncompounded nature is said to be joined with the bodily compound ἀρρήτῳ λόγῳ.[74]

The elements of argument we have gathered until now allow us to understand Gregory's answer to pagan objections against the resurrection doctrine. At the end of *De anima et resurrectione* Macrina clearly expounds the basic objection: "The person who asked the apostle how the dead rise again rejects the coming together again of the scattered elements and, since this is impossible and there is no other body left for the reunion of the elements, he says this as skilled dialecticians do and draws what appears to be a logical conclusion: viz., if the body is a union of elements, but it is impossible for this union to occur a second time, what sort of body will the risen ones use?" (152 D-153 A). The traditional agument of devoured, burnt or drowned bodies, of indirect anthropophagy, often referred to in pagan polemic and reported by Gregory himself, intends to exhibit the same difficulty: in such cases how can a body be restored and returned to its original form?[75]

In *De anima et resurrectione* Macrina replies to pagan objections on a philosophical plane: satisfying her brother's repeated invitation and offering a rational basis for the possibility of body resurrection. To this end, she sets forth her doctrine on the soul, pointing out the properties of the intelligible nature to which the soul belongs: the intelligible is simple and uncompounded and therefore indivisible; this allows the explanation of how the soul can be present in a unitary and undivided way in each element of the body, not only when they are joined to each other to form the compound, but also when, with its dissolution, they separate. That which is simple, in fact, does not break into parts according to the number of elements, but it is able to be everywhere as a whole. Moreover, the intelligible, as *adiastatos*, is free from those space-time categories peculiar to the physical reality. For this reason, even when the elements of the bodily compound return to their own locations, their spacial distance does

not prevent the intelligible nature of the soul from being present in each of them.

On the basis of these properties of the intelligible nature of the soul, Macrina can formulate her reply to pagan objections: the soul, thanks to its intelligible, simple and undimensional nature, will remain in those bodily elements with which it was originally united, even when these, by the dissolution of the compound, have gone back to the corresponding elements of the All. For this reason, at the time of the Resurrection, the soul will be able to reconstitute the bodily compound, and, what's more, it will reconstitute it from the same elements recognizing them perfectly. In fact, it has never stopped knowing them—, for it has never left them: "Thus the soul knows the individual elements which formed the body in which it dwelt, even after the dissolution of those elements. Even if nature drags them far apart from each other and, because of their basic differences prevents each of them from mixing with its opposite, the soul will, nevertheless, exist along with each element, fastening upon what is its own by its power of knowing it."[76] Consequently, there is no difficulty for the soul, at the time of the resurrection, to reunite together the elements it kept in touch with: "and if, through the power which governs all things, the dissolved parts are allowed to be united again, then like different ropes suspended from one starting point, they all follow, at the same time, him who pulls them. In the same way, through the unique force of the soul, the different elements are drawn together and the cord of our body is reconstituted by the soul, each part being folded again into its former accustomed place and embracing what is familiar to it."[77]

The question we must ask now is the following: to whom the doctrine of the soul expounded by Gregory of Nyssa in *De anima et resurrectione* owes its origin?

The features that have emerged so far seem to leave us in no doubt: Gregory moves in a view which is structured in a Neoplatonic way. That the soul, as intelligible substance (νοητὴ οὐσία), completely transcends every law of the physis; that, therefore, it is not in the body in a spatial way (οὐ τοπικῶς), but in virtue of the *energheia* that communicates to it; that, as *adiastatos*, it is present, in virtue of its simplicity, in a united and undivided manner inside everything it joins to; that, finally, once we have stated such premises, the way how the soul-intelligible joins to body-sensible is completely different from any kind of physical union between bodies, as it takes place between natures that are quite different in their essence: all the above, when taken together, represents a view which was clearly outlined in Plotinus

and in Porphyry, and, as the foregoing analysis has shown, was widely shared and used by Gregory of Nyssa. The brief discussion of Plotinus' and Porphyry's texts that follows shortly will corroborate this conclusion.

IV. *Gregory of Nyssa and the Neoplatonic Doctrine of Soul*

Porphyry's *Sententiae* opens with the contraposition between what is bodily and therefore is always place-located (ἐν τόπῳ), and the incorporeal nature that is never related to a place.[78] The soul clearly belongs to the species of the incorporeals.[79] Being such, the incorporeal is not in the body τοπικῶς, but τῇ σχέσει;[80] indeed, the incorporeal is not in the body as in a cage or in a wineskin, but in virtue of *dynameis* by which it joins to the body, in conformity with an ineffable inclination (ἄρρητος).[81] In the same way, in the *Symmikta Zetemata*, preserved by Nemesius of Emesa,[82] the soul, being incorporeal, is said not to be circumscribed in a place, but to penetrate as a whole throughout the body.[83] Hence, the body is not the ruler of the soul, but rather the contrary: the soul governs the body. Likewise, the body does not contain the soul as a vase, but in fact it is engulfed.[84] The soul is, therefore, inside the body not in a local way, like the body is in a place, but as we say that God is inside us, that is ἐν σχέσει καὶ τῷ παρεῖναι.[85]

For this reason, it is again stated in the *Sententiae*, the incorporeal, while it is united with the body, is not space-confined; the substance of the body does not prevent it from being "everywhere and everyhow it wills." In fact, from a local point of view, it is "everywhere and nowhere."[86] Thus just as God is πανταχοῦ for everything proceeds from God and is in God, and also οὐδαμοῦ, for he is not to be identified with any of the beings and he is not in them, so in the same way the soul is everywhere (πανταχοῦ) in the body, but is not body and it is nowhere (οὐδαμοῦ) in the body.[87]

This opposition between antithetic predicates is clearly used in order to eliminate from the intelligible any notion related to the bodily reality: the soul is everywhere because it is nowhere; that is, to the intelligible no spatial category can be ascribed.[88] At the same time, however, the omnipresence of the intelligible in the sensible is grounded on the absolute simplicity of the intelligible itself. This itself is a distinctive doctrine of Neoplatonism. Its origin can perhaps be traced back to Plato's *Parmenides*, where the question is asked concerning the unitary and undivided presence of the Idea in the multiplicity, and the comparison is suggested with day-light.[89] The light image often occurs in Plotinus and in Porphyry in

order to explain the manner in which the intelligible is present with the sensible.[90] In an analogous context we find it also in Gregory.[91] As a matter of fact, Plotinus contrasts the corporeal reality, the perceptible, endowed with mass and therefore divisible, which, being such, is always circumscribed by place, and intelligible nature, to which the soul belongs, undimensional, without parts and indivisible, that is, on the contrary, present as whole and in a undivided way in every part of the body.[92] The soul is not, therefore, in the body as in a place;[93] it is not the form of the body, nor is in it like the steersman in the ship;[94] its relationship to the body is rather similar to that of light, which is everywhere, but mixes with nothing, that illuminates everything without losing anything of itself;[95] also comparable to the voice, that is one, whole and indivisible, wherever it spreads.[96]

In the same way, Porphyry points out in the *Symmikta Zetemata* that that which is indivisible cannot be circumscribed by place; only that which has parts and is divisible can dwell in a place.[97] Therefore, being the *ousia* of the soul indivisible, it cannot be present in fractions: where the soul is present, it is present as a whole: for this reason, it must be present everywhere.[98] And the same view is also formulated in the *Sententiae*.[99]

If we keep in mind the corporeal und uncorporeal qualities, we must not be surprised at their difference in spite of their union: for this is not a question of the union between bodies, but between natures that are clearly distinct one from the other κατ' ἰδιότητα ὑποστάσεως; consequently, such a union will be completely different from that which usually takes place between "substances that have the same *ousia*," and "goes beyond everything that falls under the sense perception."[100]

If we compare this Neoplatonic view with that which has come out from the discussion of Gregory's texts, it is possible to observe the same features ascribed to the soul.

For both Neoplatonism and Gregory, the soul, as incorporeal, cannot be circumscribed in a place,[101] neither can it be ruled (κρατεῖται) by the body;[102] it is not, therefore, encompassed (περιέχεσθαι) in the body like in a place or like in a receptacle.[103] In this sense, it is significant that the *De anima et resurrectione* opens with the problem of soul's "location" (20 B-21 A), a theme which, in the distinction between "encompassing" and "encompassed"—both of these concepts are formulated mostly by συνέχειν or περιέχειν—played a important rôle in the philosophical tradition, both concerning the relations between soul and body and for the relation between God and world.[104] If the soul is essentially different from the body elements—affirms Gregory restating the materialistic argument—, then it is

not possible to fix the "place" where it can dwell after the compound's dissolution: "But what is nowhere certainly does not exist."[105] Indeed, for Epicurus, according to Macrina's account (21 B), the "place" of the soul is the body, which encompasses it (περιέχει) and holds it together (κρατεῖται) as a receptacle contains air;[106] as soon as it breaks up, it vanishes also along with whatever was enclosed inside.[107] Regarding this materialistic position, Macrina, during the dialogue, was to point out, in accordance with Neoplatonism, that the idea of a physical place does not make sense when we are concerned with an uncorporeal and intelligible being[108] such as the soul. It is characterized by the fact it is *adiastatos*,[109] i.e. it is not subject to the spacial categories which are only valid for the material world.

Without doubt, the thesis that soul is not "in" the body as in a place or in a receptacle had already been stated by Peripatos:[110] but in Gregory, as in the Neoplatonists, it is used to assert the transcendence, the substantiality, and therefore the immortality of the soul: the soul, while united to the body, stays distinct from it; it remains an *ens per se subsistens*, that retains the complete purity and the simplicity of its essence: this is the leading conception pointed out by Macrina in *De anima et resurrectione*, in order to refute the materialistic view. This view calls in question, first of all, the substantiality of the soul, that is the possibility that it exists by itself (τὴν ψυχὴν καθ' ἑαυτὴν εἶναι), independently of the body elements: "The body is made of elements and the elements are material, and the soul cannot exist by itself unless it is one of these and exists in them" (24 A). According to the materialistic doctrine, in fact, it is not possible to think of man as the union between two heterogeneous natures, an intelligible and incorporeal one and a sensible and corporeal one;[111] that is, it is not possible to reconcile the concept of the unity of the human being, on one side, and of incorporeity, substantiality and hence the immortality of the soul, on the other. If we want to explain in a consistent way the real unity of the human being, then it is not possible to assert that the soul is an *ens* distinct from the body. If the soul is something different (ἄλλο τι) from the body elements, as Gregory sustains while reporting the materialistic view, a real *mixis* is not possible: οὐ γὰρ ἂν γένοιτό τις τοῦ ἑτεροφυοῦς πρὸς τὸ ἀλλότριον μίξις (20 C). It is on this presupposition that the Stoic doctrine about the material nature of the soul is founded: no relation is possible between a corporeal and an uncorporeal substance.[112] If body and soul were two distinct natures in essence, there would be a παράθεσις not a μίξις, that it is to say it would not be possible to explain the psychosomatic unity of man. In any case, in such a mixture, the soul, though

united to the body, could not preserve the original properties of its nature, remaining a spiritual, simple and, so, immortal reality (21 A).[113] The necessary consequence of this view is that, with the dissolution of the bodily compound, the soul is destroyed as well (24 A).

The argumentation Macrina develops in order to contradict the materialistic view expressed by Gregory wants to state precisely the possibility of a *mixis* in man between intelligible and sensible, and, at the same time, to safeguard the distinction of the two natures. In this sense, the traditional macrocosm-microcosm analogy, on which Macrina founds, in *De an.*, 21 B-45 A, her argumentation, intends to indicate the manner in which a spiritual and transcendent nature can join to a sensible and bodily reality, remaining however distinct in the *ousia*. In just such a way the relationship between the divine nature and the world illustrates the relation between the soul and the body of man: the divine nature is present throughout the universe, by virtue of its *dynamis*, keeping it in the Being (ἐν τῷ εἶναι συνέχειν, 24 C), granting its order and harmony, even if the divine essence transcends the whole of creation; just so, in parallel, the soul is in the body in virtue of the ζωτικὴ ἐνεργεία it trasmits to it, thus conferring to it life and movement, preserving however its substantiality, its purity and the simplicity of its essence (44 B-C). The reasons for this position are clear: it is only in this way that Gregory can satisfy the two leading requirements that are at the basis of his anthropology: the unity of the human compound and, at the same time, the substantiality and the immortality of the soul, thus corresponding to the Christian principles. According to these latter, man, during his lifetime, is really one, and though his soul survives the body and leads an autonomous life until the resurrection, when it will be able to restore its former compound.

From the items we have stressed up till now, we can also understand why, given this context, we find the typically Neoplatonic question[114] about the manner the incorporeal and intelligible soul, in spite of its ontological otherness, can join to the sensible body,[115] and form together with it a whole living being, keeping however the purity and the simplicity of its own essence. For this reason, Macrina concludes her analogy macrocosm-microcosm stating that the manner in which the intelligible soul joins the sensible is something incomprehensible and unutterable: "For, as has been said before, in the case of living bodies in which there is substance resulting from the mingling of the elements, there is nothing in common between the simple and invisible essence of the soul and the coarseness of the body. Nevertheless, it is not doubted that the vital energy (ζωτικὴ ἐνεργεία) of the

soul is present in the elements diffused with a logic that is beyond human comprehension,"[116] ἀρρήτῳ λόγῳ.[117] Gregory returns many times to this idea,[118] but the Neoplatonists were the first to stress the new and unutterable character of this kind of union, that Porphyry defines as something "enigmatic,"[119] "divine and paradoxical."[120] And it was Neoplatonism that developed a philosophical demonstration[121] to explain how the intelligible soul can join to the sensible body in a way that transcends the different kinds of "physical" mixture which were distinguished by the Stoics.[122] According to Porphyry's doctrine, as Nemesius of Emesa reported it, the nature of the intelligibles is indeed such as to allow them to join to the realities which can receive them in such a profound way as for example do those things that, uniting with each other, corrupt and give rise to a new substance (as in the case of σύγχυσις). However, though united in such a manner, they remain ἀσύγχυτα καὶ ἀδιάφθορα, like things that join each other by simple contact alone (as in the case of παράθεσις).[123] The metaphysical union between the intelligible and the sensible, therefore, transcends the opposition between σύγχυσις and παράθεσις, taken in a physical sense, and combines, in a paradoxical manner, the properties of both. Hence, there must be an ἀσύγχυτος ἕνωσις between soul and body; for this permits the explanation of the psychosomatic unity of man, and, at the same time, safeguarding the transcendence and the substantiality of the soul.[124]

The anthropological view developed by Gregory of Nyssa attests, therefore, to a philosophical progress that is, at least in part, due to Neoplatonism.[125] Behind this view there is, for Gregory just as for the Neoplatonists, the awareness of the profound originality of a union, such as that between intelligible and sensible, that infringes the laws of the physis, and is therefore absolutely incomprehensible on physical grounds.

For this reason, Macrina in the *De anima et resurrectione* points out how the pagan objections to the Christian doctrine of resurrection could be resolved thanks to those properties of the intelligible natures that pagan philosophy itself employed to explain the species of union, being no less "paradoxical" and "enigmatic," between the soul and the body of man.

NOTES

[1] H.M. Meissner, *Rhetorik und Theologie. Der Dialog Gregors von Nyssa De anima et resurrectione*, Frankfurt am Main-Bern-New York-Paris 1991.

[2] Meissner, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 and 18.

[3] Meissner, *op. cit.*, pp. 47 ff.

[4] On the Macrina's rôle as διδάσκαλος λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, cf. Meissner, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 ff., 382-384.

[5] Cf. *De an.*, PG 46, 18A.

[6] Cf. Meissner, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

[7] Meissner, *op. cit.*, demonstrated this point quite correctly against the one-sided interpretations of H.F. Cherniss, *The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa*, Berkeley 1930, and of C. Apostolopoulos, *Phaedo Christianus*, Frankfurt am Main-Bern-New York 1986; about this latter work see also the J.C.M. van Winden's remarks in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 41 (1987), pp. 191-197.

[8] The soul is a leading subject as well in Neoplatonic philosophy (how seriously this problem was thought about is shown by Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, 13, 10 f.): it is enough to mention Plotinus' fourth *Ennead*, that is entirely devoted to the soul (IV 1-2, "On the essence of the soul"; IV 3-5, "On difficulties about the soul"; IV 7, "On the immortality of the soul"; IV 8, "On the descent of the soul into bodies"; IV 9, "If all souls are one"), Iamblichus' treatise Περὶ ψυχῆς, and the writings on this theme by Porphyry (*Symmikta Zetemata*; Περὶ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεων; Πρὸς Ταῦρον, etc., cf. R. Beutler, Porphyrios, *RE* XXII 1, 1953, coll. 289-290). In this context we can also cite the commentaries on Aristotle's *De anima*: cf. H. Dörrie – M. Baltes, *Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1983, pp. 300, 345.

[9] Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *De an.*, PG 46, 17 B: Gregory refers here to the theme of the immortality of the soul; on this matter see also Plotinus' criticism against Epicureans and Stoics: *Enn.*, IV 7, 2-4; similarly, Longinus wrote a monography (whose long quotation is in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.*, XV 21, 1-3), where he polemizes against the materialistic doctrine of soul due to Stoa and to Epicurus; even Porphyry, in his work Περὶ ψυχῆς πρὸς Βόηθον (cf. Beutler, Porphyrios, cit., col. 289: fragments in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.*, XI 28; 14, 10, 3; XV 11; 15, 16; Simplicius, *In Arist. De an.*, p. 247, 23 ff. Hayduck), supported the doctrine of the immortality of the soul principally against the peripatetic Boethus, but also against the Stoa and Epicurus (cf. P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, I, Berlin 1973, pp. 172 ff.).

[10] Cf. A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, III: *Les doctrines de l'âme*, Paris 1953, pp. 1-26.

[11] As a matter of fact, the dialogue opens with the problem of corporeity or incorporeity of the soul (25 A-44 A), which includes a criticism of the materialistic doctrine of Stoics and Epicureans and a proof of the immaterial nature of the soul (25 A-33 C; 29 B: definition of soul as οὐσία γενετή, ζῶσα, νοερά—cf. Aetius, *Placita*, IV 3; Tertullian, *De an.*, V 1 ff.; Albinus, *Did.*, 117, 19 f. H. = p. 49, 10 f. Whittaker; Plotinus, *Enn.*, IV 7, 1-85; Nemesius of Emesa, *De nat. hom.*, pp. 67 f. Matthaei = pp. 16 f. Morani; Iamblichus, *De an.*, apud Stobaeus, *Ecl.*, I 362 ff. W). The characteristics of the οὐσία νοερά of the soul are then discussed (45 C-48 B) as an introduction to a rational justification for the doctrine of the resurrection. The dialogue then (48 C-68 A) deals with the problem of the faculties (δυνάμεις, κινήσεις), connected to that of the relationship between soul (= nous) and body in the man (into which the irrational and inferior tendencies of the soul are referred), and to the ethical theme of the rule of the πάθη by the nous (cf. Aetius, *Plac.*, IV 4; Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De an.*, 27, 1 ff. Bruns; Tertullian, *De an.*, XIV 2-3; Albinus, *Did.*, XXIV 1-2, pp. 176, 30 ff. H. = p. 46, 35 ff. Whittaker; Plotinus, *Enn.*, III 4, 2; VI 7, 14; Porphyry, Περὶ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς

δυνάμεων, apud Stobaeus, *Ecl.*, I 347, 19 ff. W.; Proclus, *In Tim.*, II 125, 10 ff. D.). Gregory then (108 A-128 B) goes on to the "quaestio" about the soul's origin (cf. Tertullian, *De an.*, XXIII-XXIV; Plotinus, *Enn.*, IV 8; Iamblichus, *De an.*, apud Stobaeus, *Eccl.*, I 371, 13-379, 10 W.). First he criticizes the pagan-Platonic doctrine of the metempsychosis (108 B-109 A: doctrine; 109 B-112 C, and 116 B-C: elenchos) and of the pre-existence of souls (112 C-121 A). He concludes by offering the solution of the "quaestio" (121 A-128 C): the simultaneous origin of soul and body by the generation on the ground of the argument of embryo animation (125 A-128 B; cf. *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 236 A-B; cf. Aetius, *Placita*, V 3-6: περὶ σπέρματος, etc., V 15-16, 18, 21: περὶ ἐμβρύου; Albinus, *Did.*, p. 178, 26 ff. H. = p. 49, 10 Whittaker; Tertullian, *De an.*, V 25-27, 36-37). The ζήτησις about the soul ends, in conformity with the traditional outline of the "quaestiones de anima" (cf., for example, Tertullian, *De an.*, LIV-LVIII; Iamblichus, *De an.*, apud Stobaeus, *Ecl.*, I 454, 10 ff.), with the eschatological doom of the soul, revising a theme already explained in the course of the dialogue (85 B-88 C, being the need for the soul to free itself by virtuous behaviour from every προσπάθεια for material things; 89 B-108 C, being κάθαρσις of the soul as necessary requirement for the ὁμοίωσις πρὸς τὸ θεῖον). In conformity with the unitary σκοπός of the work, that we have outlined in previous pages, the concluding part is devoted to the doctrine of resurrection.

[12] Cf. E. Peroli, *Il Platonismo e l'antropologia filosofica di Gregorio di Nissa.* Introduction by C. Moreschini, Milano 1993, spec. capp. II, III, IV (pp. 89-95), and VII (pp. 237-251).

[13] Cf., for example, Augustine, *Enn. in Ps.*, 138 II 5 (CC 39, p. 1237).

[14] Ἄφελε πάντα, according to Plotinus' imperative, *Enn.*, V 3, 17, 38; VI 8, 15, 33; VI 8, 19, 4; VI 8, 21, 26 f.

[15] Cf. *Phaedo*, 64 C, 79 C-D, 81 C-D.

[16] Cf., for example, Plotinus, *Enn.*, III 6, 6, 72 ff.

[17] Cf. *Phaedo*, 79 C-D.

[18] *Ibid.*, 64 A-66 A.

[19] *Ibid.*, 66 B-67 B.

[20] *Enn.*, III 6, 6, 71-72

[21] *Ibid.*, III 6, 6, 72-77.

[22] *Ibid.*, IV 8, 1, 1-7.

[23] *Ibid.*, III 9, 8, 45; VI 8, 4, 31 f.

[24] *Ibid.*, VI 9, 3, 22 f.

[25] Cf. H. Dörrie, Die platonische Theologie des Kelsos in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit der christlichen Theologie, in *Platonica minora*, München 1976, pp. 232 f.

[26] As for this view of an original revelation, that goes back, beyond Plato, to the *palaioi theologoi*, cf. C. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos. Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum*, Berlin 1955, pp. 242 ff.; H. Dörrie, Die Frage nach dem Transzendentem im Mittelplatonismus, in *Platonica minora*, cit., pp. 211-215. This original revelation found its climax in Plato, the πρῶτος εὑρετής, the most ancient philosopher and the only theologian, whose written texts were available. For this reason, Platonism ascribes to Plato the whole and absolute truth, that remains valid forever: cf. H. Dörrie, Plotino, innovatore o tradizionalista?, in: *Atti del Convegno internazionale sul tema: Plotino e il Neoplatonismo in Oriente e in Occidente*, Roma 1974, p. 198.

[27] Cf., for example, Plotinus, *Enn.*, II 9, 8, 14 f.; IV 8, 6, 23 f.; see also A.H. Armstrong, Man in the Cosmos. A study of some differences between pagan Neoplatonism and

Christianity, in *Plotinian and Christian Study*, London 1979, chap. XII, pp. 5-14; cf. E.P. Meijering, *God Being History. Studies in Patristic Philosophy*, Amsterdam-Oxford-New York 1975, pp. 249-276.

[28] Cf. Plotinus, *Enn.*, II 9, 2, 12 ff.; IV 3, 6, 2 ff.; IV 7, 3, 32-35.

[29] Cf. *Enn.*, II 9, 8, 15 ff.; II 9, 9, 39 f.; III 2, 14, 26 f.; III 7, 11, 27-29; V 3, 16, 8 ff.; VI 7, 7, 19 ff.; IV 4, 33, 6 ff., 36. Cf. *Timaeus*, 29 B ff., 37 C ff., and 92 C: κόσμος εἰκὼν τοῦ νοητοῦ θεὸς αἰσθητός.

[30] Cf., for example, *Enn.*, III 2, 3, 11 f.; IV 4, 38, 17 ff.

[31] Cf. *Enn.*, V 3, 15, 11: πᾶν γὰρ τὸ μὴ ἓν τῷ ἓν σῴζεται καὶ ἔστιν ὅπερ ἐστὶ τούτῳ. Cf. as well Proclus, *Elem. theol.*, 13: τῷ γὰρ ἑνὶ σῴζεται πάντα.

[32] Cf. W. Beierwaltes, *Denken des Einen*, Frankfurt am Main 1985, pp. 234-235.

[33] Cf. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos*, cit., pp. 80 ff.

[34] According to Macarius' testimony (*Apocriticus*, IV 2 = Porfirio, *Contra Christianos*, fr. 35, 1-31 Harnack), Porphyry criticized the Christian doctrine of resurrection because of the fact that the *akolouthia* of the cosmos can never be infringed; the divine Logos does not want neither can it modify this *akolouthia*, such as it can not alter mathematical truths (cf. Ps. Justin, *Quaest. graecae ad Christianos*, PG 6, 1146 C = Porphyry, *Contra Christianos*, fr. 93, 17 ff., p. 101 Harnack); for the divine Logos is the guarantor and the preserver (σῴζειν) of cosmic "legality," since this is the expression of its very essence; cf. Celsus, *ap.* Origen, *Contra Celsum*, V 14, 11-21.

[35] Cf. Dörrie, Was ist spätantiker Platonismus?, in *Platonica minora*, cit., pp. 515 f. and 522. During the last years, Dörrie has been the strongest supporter of the view of a complete irreconciliability between Platonism and Christianity. For a critical discussion of Dörrie's view, cf. E. Peroli, Il conflitto fra Platonismo e Cristianesimo nell'interpretazione di Heinrich Dörrie, published as an integrating essay in: C.J. de Vogel, *Platonismo e Cristianesimo. Antagonismo o fondamenti comuni?* (the original english version appeared in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 39, 1985, pp. 1-62), edited by G. Reale and Enrico Peroli, Milano 1993, pp. 105-138. See also E.P. Meijering, Wie platonisierten Chriesten?, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 28 (1974), pp. 15-28; Fr. Ricken, Zur Rezeption der platonischen Ontologie bei Eusebios von Kaisareia, Areios und Athanasios, *Theologie und Philosophie*, 53 (1978), pp. 321-352; A.M. Ritter, Platonismus und Christentum in der Spätantike, *Theologische Rundschau*, 49 (1984), pp. 33-56.

[36] These difficulties are reported by many Christian authors, from Irenaeus to Tertullian, up to Augustine. For a brief synthesis of these objections, which occur also in Gregory of Nyssa, cf. J. Daniélou, La résurrection des corps chez Grégoire de Nysse, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 7 (1953), pp. 162 ff.; see also P. Courcelle, Propos antichrétiens rapportés par saint Augustin, *Recherches augustiniennes*, 1 (1958), pp. 163-170.

[37] Cf. H. Chadwick, Origen, Celsus and the Resurrection of the Body, *Harvard Theological Review*, 41 (1948), pp. 84 ff.

[38] Cf. as well *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 225 C, 228 D.

[39] *De an.*, PG 46, 45 A-C.

[40] Cf. *De an.*, 76 C.

[41] Cf., for example, Porphyry, *Contra Christianos*, fr. 93, 11-17, p. 101, and fr. 94, 10-20, p. 102 Harnack.

[42] *De an.*, 45 C.

[43] Cf. Porphyry, *Contra Christianos*, fr. 35, 1-31, pp. 61-62 Harnack. On this cf. J. Pépin, *Théologie cosmique et théologie chretienne*, Paris 1964, pp. 428 ff. The order of the natural

elements, on which Porphyry founds his criticism of the doctrine of resurrection, goes back to Plato's *Timaeus* (31 B-32 C). Since the *Timaeus* such a cosmological doctrine had become a common knowledge in most of the philosophical schools (cf., for example, Ps. Arist., *De mundo*, 2-3, 391 b-393 a 8; Cicero, *De nat. deor.*, I 37, II 45, 115; Seneca, *Nat. quaest.*, II 4, 1), and is widely shared by Gregory of Nyssa (cf., for example, *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 128 C-129 C; for the probable influence by Posidonius, cf. K. Gronau, *Poseidonios und die jüdisch-christliches Genesisexegese*, Leipzig 1914, pp. 61-62, 142-146; E. von Ivánka, Die Quelle von Ciceros "De natura deorum" II 45-60 [Poseidonios bei Gregor von Nyssa], *Archivium Philologicum*, 59, 1935, pp. 10-21; J. Daniélou, La notion de confins chez Grégoire de Nysse, *Recherches de science religieuse*, 49, 1961, pp. 163-164; P. Zemp, *Die Grundlagen heilsgeschichtlichen Denkens Gregor von Nyssa*, München 1970, pp. 29-46).

[44] *De an.*, 45 D.

[45] *Ibid.*, 48 A.

[46] *Ibid.*, 45 B.

[47] *Ibid.*, 69 B.

[48] *Ibid.*, 48 A.

[49] *Ibid.*, 45 C.

[50] *Ibid.*, 48 A.

[51] Cf., for example, Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, I 4, 17; Plato, *Theaet.*, 173 E.

[52] Cf. Ps. Aristotle, *De mundo*, 1, 391 a 12 f.; Philo, *Leg. alleg.*, I 62; cf. A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, II: *Le Dieu cosmique*, Paris 1949, p. 610; such a view occurs also in Neoplatonism: cf. Nemesius, *De natura hominis*, p. 136, 3 M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 95 Dörrie; cf. also Porphyry, *Ad Marcellam*, 8-10, pp. 279-281 Nauck.

[53] Philo, *Leg. alleg.*, I 62.

[54] Cf. Pellegrino, Il Platonismo di S. Gregorio Nisseno nel dialogo "Intorno all'anima e alla risurrezione," *Rivista di Filosofia Neoscolastica*, 30 (1938), p. 441.

[55] *De an.*, 48 A-B.

[56] *Ibid.*, 48 B.

[57] *Ibid.*, 44 D-45 A.

[58] *Ibid.*, 48 A.

[59] *Ibid.*, 48 A.

[60] *Hex.*, PG 44, 84 C-D.

[61] Cf. H. von Balthasar, *Présence et Pensée*, Paris 1942, pp. 2 ss.; A. Lieske, Die Theologie der Christusmystik Gregors von Nyssa, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 70 (1948), pp. 154-156; Zemp, *Die Grundlagen*, cit., pp. 63-72; T.P. Verghese, Diastema and Diastasis in Gregory of Nyssa. Introduction to a Concept and the Posing of a Problem, in: *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie*, hrsg. von H. Dörrie, M. Altenburger, U. Schramm, Leiden 1976, pp. 243-260.

[62] Zemp, *Die Grundlagen*, cit., pp. 63-72.

[63] Cf., for example, *Eun.*, GNO I, p. 246, 16-21; 117, 6 ff.; 133, 28-134, 5.

[64] Cf. *Eccl.*, GNO V, p. 412, 14: τὸ διάστημα οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ κτίσις ἐστίν.

[65] Cf., for example, *Eun.*, GNO II, p. 226, 23-29; GNO I, p. 129, 1-28; 246, 23-247, 4.

[66] *De an.*, 45 C.

[67] Cf., for example, Aetius, *Placita*, IV 5; cf. as well, Gronau, *Poseidonios*, cit., pp. 173-178.

[68] Cf. Plato, *Tim.*, 44 D-E; Albinus, *Didaskalikos*, XVII 4, p. 173, 5 f. Hermann (= p. 39, 3 f. Whittaker).

[69] Such a view was still supported by Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De an.*, p. 94, 7 ff., and 98, 24 ff. Bruns; cf. H.J. Blumenthal, *Plotinus' Psychology*, The Hague 1971, p. 75.

[70] *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 157 D.

[71] *Ibid.*, 157 B-D.

[72] *Ibid.*, 160 D.

[73] *Ibid.*, 177 B-C.

[74] *De an.*, 44 D; cf. *Or. cat.*, PG 45, 42 B-C, 44 A-B; *Adv. Apol.*, GNO III/1, p. 156, 13-22.

[75] Cf. *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 213 C-D; *Sanct. Pasch.*, GNO IX, pp. 251, 25-252, 1. These objections go back to the beginnings of the discussion on the resurrection between pagans and christians. We find them, in fact, in Tatian (*Or. ad Graec.*, 6), in Tertullian (*De carn. res.*, 4, 11-16), in Origen (*ap.* Methodius, *De res.*, I 20, 4-5; cf. Chadwick, Origen, Celsus and the Resurrection of the Body, cit., pp. 89-91) and also in Ambrose (*De exc. fratris*, II 58, 13; cf. P. Courcelle, Anti-Christian Arguments and Christian Platonism, in: A. Momigliano [ed.], *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963, pp. 186 ff.) and in Augustine (*De civ. Dei*, XXII 12; cf. Courcelle, *Propos*, cit., pp. 163-170).

[76] *De an.*, 77 A.

[77] *Ibid.*, 77 B.

[78] Porphyry, *Sent.*, 1, p. 1 Lamberz: Πᾶν μὲν σῶμα ἐν τόπῳ, οὐδὲν δὲ τῶν καθ' αὑτὰ ἀσωμάτων ᾗ τοιοῦτον ἐν τόπῳ. This is a view we already find in Plotinus: cf. *Enn.*, V 2, 2, 19-20; VI 5, 3, 1-3; VI 4, 16, 12-13.

[79] Cf., for example, *Sent.*, 33, p. 35, 5 ff. Lamberz; and H. Dörrie, *Porphyrios' "Symmikta Zetemata,"* München 1959, pp. 59-60; Die Lehre von der Seele, in *Platonica minora*, cit., p. 177.

[80] *Sent.*, 3, p. 2, 1 ff. Lamberz: Τὰ καθ' αὑτὰ ἀσώματα, οὐ τοπικῶς παρόντα τοῖς σώμασι, πάρεστιν αὐτοῖς ὅταν βούληται, πρὸς αὐτὰ ῥέψαντα ᾗ πέφυκε ῥέπειν. καὶ τοπικῶς αὐτοῖς οὐ παρόντα, τῇ σχέσει πάρεστιν αὐτοῖς. Cf. *Sent.*, 4, p. 2, 5 ff. Lamberz.

[81] *Sent.*, 28, p. 17, 1-7 Lamberz.

[82] Cf. Dörrie, *Porphyrios' "Symmikta Zetemata,"* cit., pp. 30-103.

[83] Nemesius, *De natura hominis*, p. 133, 6 ff. M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 74 Dörrie: ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ ἀσώματος οὖσα καὶ μὴ περιγραφομένη τόπῳ ὅλη δι' ὅλου χωρεῖ καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς ἑαυτῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι μέρος φωτιζόμενον ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἐν ᾧ μὴ ὅλη πάρεστιν.

[84] Nemesius, *De nat. hom.*, p. 134, 11 M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 80 Dörrie: οὐ γὰρ κρατεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλ' αὐτὴ κρατεῖ τὸ σῶμα cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 177 B: ... οὔτε γὰρ ἐγκρατεῖται σώματα τὸ ἀσώματον.

[85] Nemesius, *De nat. hom.*, p. 135, 9 ff. M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 87 Dörrie.

[86] *Sent.*, 27, p. 16, 1 ff. Lamberz.

[87] *Sent.*, 31, p. 21, 9 ff. Lamberz.

[88] This method of antithetic predicates often occurs in Porphyry (cf. *Sent.*, 31, p. 21, 9 ff.; *Sent.*, 38, p. 46, 5 ff. Lamberz and P. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, Paris 1968, I, pp. 128-129), and we find it clearly expressed also in Plotinus: cf., for example, *Enn.* VI 8, 16, 1-3 (cf. G. Leroux, *Plotinus. Traité sur la liberté et la volonté de l'Un*, Paris 1990, pp. 352-353). Such a method, anyway, surely precedes Neoplatonism: cf. Porphyry *Sent.*,

38, p. 46, 7-8 Lamberz. For we find it in Philo (cf. *De conf. ling.*, 136; *post. Caini*, 14), in Ps. Aristotle (*De mundo*, 6, 7), in *Corp. Herm.*, XI 6. Clearly determined by Plotinus and systematized by Porphyry, such a method lastly was handed down to the Christian thought: cf. Victorinus, *Adv. Ar.*, IV 22, 8 (cf. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, I, pp. 282 e 285); Augustine, *Conf.*, VI 3; also *Gregory of Nyssa* makes use of it: cf. *Or. cat.*, PG 45, 65 D; *Adv. Apol.*, GNO III/1, p. 156, 13 ff.; cf. R. Arnou, Platonisme des Pères, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XII 2, coll. 2359-2361.

[89] Cf. Plato, *Parm.*, 131 A-B; cf. Ph. Merlan, Greek Philosophy from Plato to Plotinus, in: A.H. Armstrong (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1967, p. 23.

[90] Cf. Plotinus, *Enn.*, IV 3, 11; IV 3, 22; cf. Dörrie, *Porphyrios'* "*Symmikta Zetemata*," cit., pp. 76-79.

[91] Cf. *Beat.*, PG 44, 1196 C-D.

[92] Plotinus, *Enn.*, IV 1, 1.

[93] *Ibid.*, IV 3, 20.

[94] *Ibid.*, IV 3, 21.

[95] *Ibid.*, IV 3, 22.

[96] *Ibid.*, VI 4, 12.

[97] Nemesius, *De nat. hom.*, p. 136, 3 M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 95 Dörrie.

[98] Nemesius, *De nat. hom.*, p. 133, 6 ff. M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 74 Dörrie. Dörrie writes, p. 79: "Dies ist die Denkvoraussetzung, die Plotinus geschaffen hatte und die ganz deutlich bei Porphyrios ausgesprochen war"; cf. also pp. 96-97; about the omnipresence of the soul, cf. as well Porphyry, *Ad Marcellam*, 8-10, pp. 279-281 Nauck, and A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, IV: *Le Dieu inconnu et la gnose*, Paris 1954, pp. 225-226.

[99] *Sent.*, 33, p. 35, 13 ff.; cf. *Sent.*, 2, p. 1 Lamberz.

[100] *Sent.*, 33, p. 19 ff. Lamberz.

[101] Cf. *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 160 D, 177 B-C, 157 D: Οὐ μὴν ἀπόδειξιν ποιοῦμαι ταύτην τοῦ τοπικαῖς τισι περιγραφαῖς ἐμπεριειλῆφθαι τὴν ἀσώματον φύσιν. Cf. Nemesius, *De natura hominis*, p. 134, 7-8 M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 74 Dörrie: ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ . . . μὴ περιγραφομένη τόπῳ.

[102] Cf. Nemesius, *De natura hominis*, p. 134, 11-135, 1 M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 80 Dörrie: Οὐ γὰρ κρατεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ αὐτὴ κρατεῖ τὸ σῶμα. Gregory of Nyssa, *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 177 B: οὐ ἐγρατεῖται σώματι τὸ ἀσώματον.

[103] Cf. *De an.*, 69 B; *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 177 B.

[104] On this theme within the philosophical tradition and in Gregory of Nyssa, cf. Peroli, *Il Platonismo e l'antropologia filosofica di Gregorio di Nissa*, cit., pp. 89 ff.

[105] *De an.*, 21 A; cf. 16 B.

[106] For this Epicurean metaphor, cf. H.D. Saffrey, Homo bulla. Une image épicurienne chez Grégoire de Nysse, in: *Epektasis*, Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal J. Daniélou, publ. par J. Fontaine et Ch. Kannengiesser, Paris 1972, pp. 533-544.

[107] Cf. Epicurus, *Ep. Hdt.*, 63; 65-66; Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. math.*, IX 72 (= *Ep.*, fr. 337 Usener); Iamblichus, *De an.*, *ap.* Stobaeus, *Ecl.*, I 49, p. 384, 12-18 W. (= *Ep.*, fr. 227 Usener).

[108] Each and every body, on the contrary, is necessarily circumscribed (περιέχεσθαι) inside a definite area: *Adv. Apol.*, GNO, III/1, p. 156, 22.

[109] Cf. *De an.*, 46 C, 48 A.

[110] Cf. the long critical discussion about the ways the soul can be said to be "in" the body by Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De an.*, 13-15 Bruns (cf. Aristotle, *Phys.*, Δ 3, 210 A 15 ff.); Plotinus is following Alexander in *Enn.*, IV 3, 20; IV 3, 21: cf. Blumenthal, *Plotinus' Psychology*, cit., pp. 8-19.

[111] This μίξις τε καὶ ἀνάκρασις between the sensible and the intelligible is, according to Gregory, what the divine *Sophia* achieved in the creation of man: cf. *Or. cat.*, 26 D; *Infant.*, GNO III/2, p. 77, 14-18; p. 78, 5-23.

[112] Cf., for example, Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De anima mantissa*, p. 117, 9 Bruns = *SVF*, II 792; Tertullian, *De an.*, V 6 = *SVF*, II 791.

[113] We have here again another aspect of the Stoic view, which anyway the Platonists themselves have often made use of in order to show that, on the contrary, Stoic doctrine was unsustainable. This is pointed out by two texts by Calcidius and Priscianus, which, as H. Dörrie stressed (*Porphyrios' "Symmikta Zetemata,"* cit., pp. 30 ff., 111 f.), refer Medioplatonic views. As to the Stoic doctrine of *mixis* it is said: "Si vero permixta sunt, anima unum aliquid non erit, sed permixta multa. Stoici spiritum, id est animam, unum quid esse confitentur; non ergo permixta sunt" (Calcidius, *In Tim.*, 221, 3 = *SVF*, II 796). "Si autem miscetur, non iam unum erit anima, sed quiddam divisorum et partitorum; unum autem oportet esse animam, non igitur miscetur" (Priscianus, *Solut. ad Chosr.*, 44, 16 Bywater). As we can see, we find here the same argument as in Gregory's objection, addressed, however, against the Stoics themselves, in order to point out that their *mixis*-doctrine was not able to fulfil their initial presupposition.

[114] Cf. Peroli, *Il Platonismo e l'antropologia filosofica di Gregorio di Nissa*, cit., pp. 87-88, 206-213.

[115] These two natures, in fact, belong to two ontological spheres, which, though both created, are deeply different the one from the other: the hypercosmic ambit of intelligible and incorporeal creatures, to which the soul belongs, and the cosmic ambit of sensible natures, to which the body belongs: *Infant.*, GNO III/2, p. 78, 5 ff.; *Beat.*, PG 44, 1300 D; *Or. cat.*, PG 45, 25 D, 26 B-27 B; *Or. dom.*, PG 44, 1165 B; see also. *Infant.*, GNO III/2, p. 77, 14-18; 78, 5-23; *Or. cat.*, 26 D.

[116] *De an.*, 44 C.

[117] *Ibid.*, 44 D.

[118] Cf. *Op. hom.*, PG 44, 160 D, 177 C, 177 B; *Or. cat.*, 26 D.

[119] Cf. Nemesius of Emesa, *De nat. hom.*, p. 126, 1 M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 41 Dörrie.

[120] Porphyry, *Ad Gaurum*, X 5, 47, 20 Kalbfleisch; cf. as well Plotinus, *Enn.*, IV 3, 9, 1 ff.

[121] Cf. Dörrie, *Porphyrios' "Symmikta Zetemata,"* cit., p. 13; Dörrie defines this demonstration: "ἕνωσις-Formel," pp. 13, 55, 108, 162 ff.

[122] Cf. Dörrie, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-73.

[123] Nemesius, *De nat. hom.*, p. 129, 9-131, 4 M. = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata*, p. 54 Dörrie.

[124] It is certain that this conception was developed in a systematic and complete way by Porphyry. The self-same formula ἀσύγχυτος ἕνωσις is used by Porphyry in the work *Ad Gaurum* in order to explain the metaphysical union between the intelligible and sensible (cf. *Ad Gaurum*, X 5, p. 47, 20-27 Kalbfleisch), and it is ascribed to Porphyry himself by Proclus (*In remp.*, I 234, 15-17 Kroll). An analogous view can be found in *Sententiae*

(*Sent.*, 33, p. 37, 23-38, 5 Lamberz) and in *In Parm.*, ascribed to Porphyry by P. Hadot (*In Parm.*, XI, 10-30, in: Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, cit., II, pp. 100-101).

[125] On the other hand, the Neoplatonic doctrine of the metaphysical union between the intelligible and sensible has been widely employed by Christian writers. As A. Siclari rightly observes: "essa si doveva rivelare quanto mai adatta a risolvere una serie di non facili questioni che si erano venute profilando in seno al cristianesimo. Questioni di carattere teologico, e più specificatamente cristologico, e questioni pertinenti alla natura umana, all'unità della persona e all'immortalità dell'anima. Per la loro sorprendente adattabilità alla problematica cristiana le tesi neoplatoniche si diffusero rapidamente fra i Padri della Chiesa" (*L'antropologia di Nemesio di Emesa*, Padova 1974, p. 67). Here it is sufficient to cite, for instance, Augustine, who, in *Epist.* 137,11, answers pagan antagonists to the Incarnation using the Porphyrean *zetema* about the union of soul and body (as E.L. Fortin clearly showed, *Christianisme et culture philosophique*, Paris 1959, pp. 111 ff.; see also J. Pépin, Une nouvelle source de saint Augustin, *Revue des études anciennes*, 66, 1964, pp. 53-107). And Nemesius himself, after expounding Porphyry's view, applies the same philosophical doctrine to explain the possibility of the union between divine nature and human nature in Christ (*De nat. hom.*, p. 137, 4 ff. Matthaei = p. 42, 10 ff. Morani). As for the rôle this Neoplatonic doctrine plays in the christological discussion of Gregory of Nyssa, cf. Peroli, *Il Platonismo e l'antropologia filosofica di Gregorio di Nissa*, cit., pp. 213 ff.

Via B.G. della Verna, 39
63023 *Fermo* (AP)
Italia

LES MONIALES DE L'ARISTOCRATIE: GRANDEUR ET HUMILITÉ

PAR

P. LAURENCE

La deuxième moitié du IV^{ème} siècle vit la conversion croissante de l'aristocratie à la religion chrétienne.[1] L'exemple fut surtout donné par les femmes.[2] Certaines[3] n'hésitèrent pas à quitter le siècle pour un monastère, et même à prendre l'initiative d'en fonder un, voire plusieurs.[4] Elles y retrouvèrent des membres d'autres classes sociales, ne serait-ce que parce qu'elles avaient été suivies par certaines de leurs esclaves.[5] Nommées "*ancillae Christi*" de par l'humilité à laquelle elles se consacraient,[6] les anciennes *dominae* devinrent donc des "*conseruae*," les compagnes de celles qui, jusqu'alors, étaient à l'autre bout de l'échelle sociale.

Mais à quel point faut-il croire Jérôme lorsqu'il dit que l'apparence et l'attitude de son amie Paula dans le monastère de Bethléem la faisaient paraître "la dernière des servantes"?[7] Derrière le principe d'égalité dans l'humilité, ne peut-on deviner une réalité plus complexe? En effet, au moins pour certaines des femmes habituées à commander à leurs esclaves et à vivre une existence totalement distincte de celle des classes plus humbles, il devait être bien difficile de faire totalement abstraction de leur vie passée: la coexistence avec des sœurs esclaves ou issues du bas-peuple n'allait pas de soi dans une vie communautaire au quotidien. La question concernait aussi bien les moniales nobles que la personne qui fondait le monastère et (ou) qui le dirigeait. Par ailleurs, il est difficile d'admettre que les auteurs des hagiographies n'aient pas tenu compte de l'origine noble de leurs héroïnes au moment d'évoquer leur entrée dans un monastère.

Pour étudier ce paradoxe d'une humilité de principe qui ne peut évacuer toute grandeur de ce monde, le champ de recherche est fourni par les communautés d'Orient et d'Occident, dans la période allant du IV^{e} au VI^{e} siècle. Les indices apparaissent aussi bien dans les Règles écrites pour les moniales que dans les Vies de saintes ou dans la correspondance de différents écrivains chrétiens. L'étude porte ici sur les monastères féminins,

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 140-157

mais des rapprochements avec le cénobitisme masculin fournissent également quelques précieuses informations.

La première question à examiner est celle de la conservation du nom et de son pouvoir lors de l'entrée dans un monastère. Sur ce point, les fondatrices méritent une attention particulière, comme en témoignent les Vies qui leur sont consacrées: la fondation et la direction d'un couvent par une femme noble ne pouvait pas ne pas avoir une influence sur ses rapports avec autrui. Mais plus largement, l'ensemble des moniales nobles doit obéir à des préceptes de la vie cénobitique qui vont à l'encontre des privilèges dont elles jouissaient dans le monde, qu'il s'agisse du savoir, de l'argent ou simplement du bien-être physique. Aussi terminerai-je mon enquête par cet aspect, les petits faits de la vie quotidienne n'étant pas les moins riches de signification.

Constatons tout d'abord qu'une femme noble qui entre dans un monastère n'est pas regardée de la même manière qu'une personne du commun. La preuve en est que ceux qui lui écrivent ou qui rédigent sa biographie ne perdent pas une occasion de la féliciter de sa décision: implicitement ou explicitement, le mérite d'une aristocrate est considéré comme particulièrement grand,[8] car elle accepte d'adopter un mode de vie qui semble entraîner un bouleversement total de ses valeurs sociales. Ainsi, nous dit Jérôme, Lea était "d'une humilité si grande et si soumise, qu'ayant été jadis la maîtresse d'un grand nombre d'esclaves, on la croyait la servante de toute l'humanité."[9] Le rapprochement entre les deux conditions a ici une fonction valorisante: selon l'auteur de sa *Vie*, les anciens serviteurs d'Olympias "paraissaient, par leurs dehors, plus nobles que cette sainte."[10] On assiste ainsi à un renversement: la supériorité de l'aristocrate sur l'esclave provient, non plus de sa naissance, mais de son humilité; elle est d'ordre spirituel, et non social: les servantes de Demetrias sont invitées par Augustin à imiter "celle qui s'élève davantage qu'elles grâce à son humilité."[11] D'où ce qu'écrit Pélage à cette même vierge du Christ, "vierge noble, vierge riche, et qui, ce qui est plus grand, foule aux pieds, dans l'ardeur de sa foi, et la noblesse, et les richesses."[12]

Que la vie monastique signifiât le renoncement aux privilèges de son rang,[13] et le refus des compromissions avec le siècle et ses honneurs, les moniales nobles l'avaient fort bien compris et ne se privaient pas toujours de le faire savoir: lorsque Mélanie la Jeune se fut convertie, l'inquiétude suscitée par ses esclaves qui protestaient contre la vente de ses biens la força à se rendre auprès de l'impératrice Serena pour obtenir son appui.

Mais, à l'encontre de ceux qui "lui disaient qu'il lui fallait, selon l'habitude en vigueur à Rome chez les personnes de rang sénatorial, avoir, au cours de la visite, la tête découverte," elle refusa de se plier à l'étiquette et de changer d'habit.[14] Si l'on en croit l'auteur de la *Vie*, cette attitude força l'admiration de l'impératrice chrétienne, qui dit ouvertement ce que le choix de vie de Mélanie pouvait avoir de redoutable pour une femme de sa classe.[15]

Cependant, outre le fait qu'il n'est pas impossible de deviner—du moins chez certaines de ces femmes et chez leurs biographes—le désir de conserver quelque chose de leur supériorité d'antan, en substituant une hiérarchie spirituelle à une hiérarchie sociale, certains détails laissent à entendre que l'entreprise de rabaissement volontaire n'allait pas toujours de soi. Sinon, pourquoi Grégoire de Nysse écrirait-il qu'au moment de la transformation de la maison familiale en monastère, Macrine "*persuade* sa mère de renoncer à son mode de vie accoutumé *et à ses manières de grande dame*," ainsi qu'au service de ses esclaves, pour vivre en communauté avec elles"?[16] N'est-ce pas rappeler ce qu'il peut y avoir de pénible, pour une noble habituée aux honneurs, à ne pas réclamer davantage d'égards que n'importe quelle autre moniale?[17]

Les auteurs des Règles connaissent bien ce problème. Ils commencent par interdire—fût-ce à l'abbesse—de posséder des esclaves à l'intérieur du monastère:[18] des infractions devaient avoir lieu.[19] Ils demandent également aux moniales nobles de ne pas manifester de mépris à l'égard de leurs compagnes d'origine humble et pauvre[20] (tout en invitant ces dernières à ne pas s'enorgueillir de ce qu'"elles se trouvent en société avec celles qu'elles n'osaient approcher à l'extérieur"[21]). Césaire écrit: "Si vous êtes nobles de naissance, réjouissez-vous plutôt de l'humilité de la vie religieuse que de la dignité séculière."[22] Or, il ne devait pas toujours en être ainsi, si l'on en croit Cassien évoquant ceux qui "se gonflent de vanité," notamment parce qu'"ils ont des parents riches et nobles."[23]

De plus, si le bon fonctionnement du monastère dépend du respect de l'égalité entre ses membres, cela ne signifie pas pour autant qu'il n'existe pas de hiérarchie. Or, l'existence de celle-ci entraîne un autre prescription, celle de l'obéissance.[24] C'est au sujet de cette vertu, fondamentale dans la vie monastique,[25] que Mélanie la Jeune "enseignait de nombreux préceptes."[26] La règle s'appliquait à toutes les religieuses, aux nobles comme aux autres.[27] Mais alors que la chose était simple dans le cas du cénobitisme égyptien (celui de Pachôme recrutait parmi les paysans), il en allait souvent autrement en Occident, où l'aristocratie formait une part non négligeable des communautés.[28]

Au sommet de cette hiérarchie se trouve l'abbesse, et l'autorité—parfois contestée[29]—que lui confère sa fonction. Or, bien que les biographes mettent l'accent sur l'humilité des femmes qui portent ce titre,[30] l'origine sociale n'était manifestement pas dénuée d'importance lorsqu'il s'agissait de la fondation et de la direction d'un monastère.

Tout d'abord, la première femme à diriger le couvent est généralement celle qui, grâce à sa fortune, a pris en charge la construction, ou a reconverti l'une de ses propriétés pour abriter sa communauté. Mélanie l'Ancienne,[31] Paula,[32] Olympias[33] et Mélanie la Jeune[34] sont dans le premier cas, et le second est illustré par Lea,[35] Marcella,[36] Macrine,[37] ainsi que Mélanie la Jeune dans les premiers temps de sa conversion.[38] Même si elles ne portent pas toujours le titre officiel d'abbesse ou de mère—telle Mélanie la Jeune[39]—, leur autorité n'en existe pas moins; elle relève du charisme,[40] mais aussi de l'appartenance à une grande famille.[41] D'ailleurs, au moins dans les premiers temps, la succession pour le titre d'abbesse se fait souvent à l'intérieur de la *gens*,[42] en sorte que l'on peut se demander si la naissance n'a pas autant d'importance que le mérite et la vertu. Plus largement, le fait d'appartenir ou non à l'élite sociale devait jouer un rôle, si l'on en juge d'après certains rappels à l'ordre contre des pratiques de ce type.[43] N'était-il pas naturel que les femmes nobles qui avaient vécu un certain temps dans le monde soient plébiscitées de préférence aux autres, pour leur expérience du pouvoir et du commandement—sans parler de leur instruction, indispensable pour une personne appelée à diriger d'autres sœurs?[44]

De plus, bien que les relations avec le monde extérieur aient été strictement limitées dès l'apparition des monastères[45] et que la tendance à une clôture stricte se soit rapidement confirmée,[46] la règle ne s'applique pas de la même manière à une abbesse et à une simple religieuse: alors qu'elle prend des mesures pour éviter les sorties de ses moniales,[47] Mélanie la Jeune n'hésite pas à revenir à Constantinople, ne serait-ce que pour convertir son oncle Rufius Antonius Agrypnius Volusianus.[48] Sa grand-mère, Mélanie l'Ancienne, avait déjà quitté le Mont des Oliviers et fait ce voyage tout au début du siècle, aux mêmes fins de catéchisation.[49]

L'aristocrate qui dirige un monastère continue donc d'entretenir des relations avec les membres de sa classe: l'installation de Mélanie l'Ancienne à Jérusalem ne signifia pas pour autant la rupture des relations avec sa famille demeurée à Rome, puisque Publicola et Albina donnèrent son nom à sa petite fille; à son retour, un accueil chaleureux lui fut réservé à Naples.[50] Sa petite-fille, outre ses contacts fréquents avec sa cousine Paula la Jeune,[51] escorta Silvie de Jérusalem à Péluse peu de temps avant son retour à

Rome;[52] en 436, elle rendit visite à l'empereur Théodose, à Constantinople;[53] de retour à Jérusalem, ce fut l'impératrice Eudoxia qui vint la voir.[54] C'est aussi un voyage en Terre sainte qui conduit l'aristocrate romaine Fabiola chez ses amis Paula et Jérôme.[55]

Ce tissu de relations permettait d'intervenir dans des affaires extérieures au monastère: à la charnière des IV^e^ et V^e^ siècles, au moment de la querelle origéniste et du scandale du *Peri Archôn*,[56] la direction de sa communauté monastique n'empêcha pas Marcella de s'élever contre Rufin pour protéger Jérôme:[57] en œuvrant de concert avec son cousin Pammachius, elle mobilisa la *gens Caeionia* et celle de son parent (la *gens Furia*), alors que le clan de Rufin était soutenu par la *gens Turcia*. Or, l'un des membres de cette dernière, Turcius Apronianus,[58] avait épousé Avita, une parente de Mélanie l'Ancienne.[59] On peut donc imaginer que celle-ci, qui était demeurée à Jérusalem en compagnie de Rufin, eut son mot à dire dans un conflit qui engageait les siens.[60] Et ce double exemple n'est pas unique: au début du V^e^ siècle, lors de l'exil de Jean Chrysostome, Olympias[61] "persistait à vouloir faire agir toutes sortes de personnalités de la Cour et du clergé en faveur de son rappel";[62] Mélanie la Jeune en fit de même: selon Gerontius, elle n'hésita pas à s'adresser à des personnages importants pour aider à la conversion de son oncle.[63]

Il est donc clair que l'entrée d'une femme noble dans un monastère ne suffisait pas à modifier l'image que l'on se faisait d'elle, ou (et) qu'elle avait jusqu'alors cherché à imposer aux autres. Il n'en reste pas moins que, future abbesse ou non, elle n'a pas engagé seulement son nom lors de sa conversion au style de vie monastique: elle a aussi promis de respecter des préceptes portant sur deux autres valeurs chères à sa classe, à savoir la culture et les biens matériels—sans oublier l'ascèse physique dont la pratique quotidienne impose sans doute un sacrifice aussi grand, celui du confort et de son bien-être.

La *lectio diuina*, lecture et étude des Ecritures saintes, est au centre de la vie du monastère.[64] Paula l'exige de ses moniales: "Aucune des sœurs ne pouvait ignorer les Psaumes, et ne pas apprendre chaque jour un passage des Ecritures saintes."[65] Mais cette pratique commune cache d'autres aspects. En effet, le monastère de Paula réunissait des femmes "aussi bien nobles que de moyenne et infime origine."[66] Ces dernières étaient probablement analphabètes, et il fallait les instruire.[67] Rien de tel chez les femmes nobles, à qui l'instruction avait permis d'accéder à la culture.[68] Les biographes sacrifient d'ailleurs volontiers à l'éloge de leur savoir: Marcella,[69] Paula,[70] Mélanie la Jeune[71] et Macrine[72] sont dites briller en ce domaine.

Ainsi, à la différence de leurs compagnes, elles ne se contentaient pas de lire et de psalmodier: Marcella et Paula avaient été initiées à l'exégèse par Jérôme durant le séjour de celui-ci à Rome de 382 à 385.[73] Après son départ, et une fois installées dans leur monastère, elles continuèrent à étudier: Marcella reçut une lettre portant sur "cinq problèmes du Nouveau Testament,"[74] et Paula—avec sa fille Eustochium—ne cessa de se voir dédier des Commentaires.[75] Même curiosité intellectuelle chez Mélanie qui, lors de son voyage à Constantinople, prodigua ses connaissances scripturaires à "beaucoup de femmes de sénateurs, et d'autres personnages des plus brillants par la culture."[76]

Selon les conventions sociales, la richesse représente une autre source de considération. Or, les personnages dont nous parlons sont des femmes riches.[77] La vie monastique comportant un renoncement à l'argent,[78] il est exigé du noble "qu'il soit déchargé du poids de sa richesse."[79] En accord avec ce commandement, Paula "interdisait à ses moniales de posséder quoi que ce fût en dehors de la nourriture et du vêtement."[80] Mais c'était souvent le monastère qui recevait l'argent, au moins en partie.[81] Même si elle ne ressentait aucun regret de sa fortune passée,[82] la moniale qui était à l'origine de ce don[83] ne pouvait-elle en concevoir une certaine vanité? Il semble bien que oui, puisqu'Augustin, notamment, demande aux moniales qui possédaient une fortune de ne pas mépriser leurs compagnes pauvres.[84] D'ailleurs, bien qu'à en croire leurs biographes des femmes telles que Paula ou Mélanie la Jeune aient toujours manifesté la plus grande humilité, une certaine gloire n'en rejaillissait pas moins sur celles qui, après avoir fourni l'argent pour la fondation du monastère,[85] continuaient à distribuer largement autour d'elles, tout en vivant parmi les moniales (ce qui prouve qu'elles disposaient encore des fonds nécessaires): les biographes se montrent très éloquents à ce sujet.[86] Leurs éloges montent que l'argent—utilisé aux meilleures fins—contribuait à modifier le regard porté sur une religieuse, puisqu'eux-mêmes y sont sensibles.

Parmi les privilèges que l'argent avait procurés aux femmes de l'aristocratie avant qu'elles ne devinssent des religieuses se trouvait la possibilité de ne rien faire, largement offerte à celle qui était toujours entourée "d'eunuques, de servantes et de petits esclaves" à son service.[87] Or, la vie dans un monastère contenait parmi ses préceptes celui du travail manuel,[88] notamment pour les femmes:[89] à Bethléem, dans le monastère de Paula, les trois groupes de religieuses se séparent pour le travail, et "Paula ne permet à aucune d'être inactive."[90] Cependant, la chose n'était sans doute pas du goût de toutes les nobles:[91] en 384, Jérôme imagine la réplique d'Eustochium

lorsqu'il lui recommande l'abandon des richesses: "Mais, diras-tu, je suis une jeune fille d'éducation raffinée, et qui ne peut travailler de ses mains."[92] Certes, une fois à Bethléem, cette vierge travaillera comme les autres,[93] mais la répartition en trois groupes laisse deviner une adaptation des tâches à l'origine sociale. En effet, si le fait de filer de la laine ou du lin n'avait rien de déshonorant pour une femme noble,[94] il en était tout autrement des besognes qui, par définition, incombaient aux esclaves: lorsqu'il loue Paula et Eustochium pour avoir accepté de faire le ménage et la cuisine, leur panégyriste ne manque pas de souligner ce que cela peut avoir d'extraordinaire, d'exceptionnel.[95]

Une admiration du même ordre se manifeste lorsque sont évoquées les prouesses de certaines aristocrates en matière d'ascèse physique: Jean Chrysostome s'extasie de la résistance d'Olympias qui, jusqu'à sa conversion, n'avait connu que la "dolce vita";[96] évoquant l'habit de Mélanie la Jeune (un manteau, un voile, et surtout un cuculle de crin), Gerontius s'étonne qu'elles ne les quitte jamais, "malgré toute la délicatesse de son éducation." Il illustre ce commentaire par le récit d'une inflammation de peau autrefois causée par "une étoffe de grand prix" qui "avait touché la tendre peau de son héroïne;"[97] pour Pélage, la moindre vertu de Demetrias, "nourrie dans l'opulence et les délices," n'est pas "de s'être arrachée aux douceurs si nombreuses et si variées de son existence," ni "d'avoir renoncé aux voluptés."[98]

De tels propos montrent les difficultés du tel mode de vie monastique pour les femmes nobles. Mélanie et Pinien en étaient conscients, eux qui, au moins dans les premiers temps de leur conversion,[99] évitèrent de pratiquer une ascèse trop sévère.[100] Les conseillers spirituels et les auteurs de Règles prévoient donc pour les moniales nobles certains adoucissements (le problème devait se présenter régulièrement, sous forme de maladies, ou de protestations de la part de l'intéressée). Ainsi, Augustin déclare que les religieuses à qui l'éducation a donné une certaine résistance physique ne doivent pas trouver choquant ni injuste que celles qui ont été élevées avec plus de délicatesse obtiennent davantage en matière de nourriture, de vêtements et de couchage:[101] n'était-ce pas l'une des raisons pour lesquelles Paula avait séparé ses moniales pour les repas, faisant ainsi preuve à la fois de bon sens et d'humanité?

Pouvons-nous donc vraiment parler d'égalité à propos des femmes de l'aristocratie qui, dans les premiers temps de la vie cénobitique, abandonnent le siècle pour la vie communautaire? Il ne fait aucun doute que la

très grande majorité d'entre elles n'abritèrent jamais en leur cœur d'autre intention que celle de l'obéissance à la règle de l'humilité, et qu'elles vécurent de leur plein gré selon des règles d'existence—et de coexistence—qui firent d'elles de simples moniales parmi d'autres. Mais le risque de regretter leur ancien pouvoir n'en existait pas moins: certaines cédèrent à la tentation, et elles manifestèrent des attitudes plus proches de leur vie passée que de leur nouveau choix.

La chose n'a rien d'étonnant; car l'existence dans un monastère était mille fois plus proche du mode de vie du petit peuple que de celui de l'aristocratie: prestige, richesse, confort et bien-être matériel, la femme noble perdait tout lorsqu'elle choisissait le cénobitisme, alors que celle qui était issue des couches sociales les plus humbles y trouvait sécurité et justice. Pour les femmes pauvres, la vie monastique représentait une véritable "promotion," alors qu'une aristocrate acceptait un sacrifice total, absolu. Il était donc inévitable qu'il lui arrivât de prendre certaines revanches, ou du moins de se laisser aller à quelques faiblesses: la moniale pauvre n'en faisait-elle pas de même lorsqu'elle se targuait d'être devenue l'égale de celle qui dans le siècle lui demeurait inaccessible?

Il n'en reste pas moins que le problème ne se posa pas de la même manière en Orient, où les monastères recrutaient essentiellement dans les couches sociales les plus basses, et dans l'Occident où la conversion de l'aristocratie fit entrer dans les couvents un nombre important de nobles: le fait que Paula ait décidé une répartition correspondant à celle de la société et que le monachisme martinien ait adopté un mode de vie des plus tolérants en raison de l'origine de ses membres montre qu'il était impossible d'ignorer la question.

Il faut aussi tenir compte du cas très particulier que représentent les fondatrices: en tant que telles, et au su de tout ce que leur devait le monastère—à commencer par son existence même—, il était inconcevable de ne pas leur accorder un prestige unique en son genre. Les moniales aussi bien que les biographes les savaient "différentes," et leurs contacts avec l'extérieur suffisent à montrer qu'elles ne vivaient pas la vie cénobitique comme les autres.

En fait, la biographie d'une Macrine ou d'une Mélanie est la meilleure preuve de l'ambiguïté propre à la situation d'une femme noble dans un monastère: les éloges qui sont décernés à ces personnages s'adressent évidemment à leurs vertus et au mérite de leur ascèse; mais, consciemment ou non, le panégyriste trouve constamment dans l'origine sociale de la sainte une raison supplémentaire de chanter ses louanges: on sent aussi

chez lui le besoin de rendre hommage à la descendante d'une grande famille (et il le fait explicitement), à une femme qui, malgré sa conversion, demeure fidèle à ses ancêtres en ce qu'elle continue à les honorer par le caractère émérite de ses vertus. Aux yeux de Jérôme, Paula n'est probablement pas si éloignée de Cornelia, elle qui guida sa fille Eustochium dans une voie non moins glorieuse que celle où marchèrent Tiberius et Caius Gracchus, ses ancêtres.

NOTES

[1] Voir notamment P. Brown, *Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy* in *JRS* 51, 1961, pp. 1-11; A. Chastagnol, *Le sénateur Volusien et la conversion d'une famille de l'aristocratie romaine au Bas-Empire* in *REA* 58, 1956, pp. 241-253; J. Fontaine, *L'aristocratie occidentale devant le monachisme aux IV^e^ et V^e^ siècles* in *RSLR* 15, 1979, pp. 28-53.

[2] A. Yarbrough, *Christianization in the Fourth Century: The Example of Roman Women* in *Church History*, 1976, pp. 149-165.

[3] Origine noble des personnages concernés: Mélanie l'Ancienne appartient à la *gens Antonia* (A. Chastagnol, *Les fastes de la Préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire*, Paris, 1962, *stemma* p. 295), et sa petite-fille se rattache aussi à la *gens Valeria* par son grand-père Valerius Maximus (*ib.*); l'*Ep.* 24 de Jérôme, consacrée à Lea, évoque la vie d'une noble; Marcella est née de la *gens Caeionia* (A. Chastagnol, *ib.*, p. 293), Paula de la *gens Aemilia* (Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 1 et 3, Labourt 5, pp. 160 et 161); Proba et Demetrias sont membres de la *gens Anicia* (A. Chastagnol, *ib., stemma* p. 291); Olympias appartient à l'élite sociale de Constantinople (*Vie d'Olympias*, 2, A.M. Malingrey, *S.C.* 13, pp. 408-410) et Macrine est "d'excellente naissance" (Grégoire de Nysse, *Vie de sainte Macrine*, 4, P. Maraval, *S.C.* 178, p. 152), ainsi que Synclétique (*Vie de sainte Synclétique*, 5, Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1972, p. 22). Pour les références et les traductions de ces ouvrages (ainsi que de ceux qui viennent), je renvoie aux éditions nommées lors de la première occurence.

[4] Deuxième moitié du IV^e^ s.: Mélanie l'Ancienne à Jérusalem (Palladius, *Histoire lausiaque*, 46, 5, éd. Bartelink, p. 222); Lea à Rome (Jérôme, *Ep.* 24, 4, Labourt 2, p. 12); Marcella dans sa demeure suburbaine de Rome (Jérôme, *Ep.* 127, 8, Labourt 7, p. 143); Paula à Bethléem (Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 14, Labourt 5, p. 176); Olympias à Constantinople (*Vie d'Olympias*, 6, 21, p. 418); Macrine à Annisa (*Vie de Macrine*, 11, pp. 173-175). V^e^ s.: Mélanie la Jeune à Jérusalem (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 41, D. Gorce, *S.C.* 90, p. 204); Synclétique à Alexandrie (*Vie de Synclétique*, 4, p. 22—à condition que ce personnage ait réellement existé, ce qui n'est pas certain: *ibid.*, intr. p. 8).

[5] Lorsqu'elle part habiter sur ses terres de Sicile et de Campanie avec sa mère Albina, Mélanie la Jeune est accompagnée "de soixante vierges, libres *et servantes*" (*Histoire lausiaque*, 61, 6, p. 266). Le monastère qu'elle fait construire en Afrique pour les femmes contient cent trente "vierges du Christ," et celui des hommes quatre-vingt moines, "*à partir de leurs propres serviteurs et servantes*" (*Vie latine de Mélanie*, 22, éd. Cardinal Rampolla, Rome, 1905, p. 14); la domesticité de Paula "est changée par elle, d'esclaves et de servantes, en frères et en sœurs" (Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 2, Labourt 5, p. 160; voir aussi *ib.*, 20, p. 185): avec les femmes du bas-peuple, elles forment ce que Jérôme appelle

l'*infimum genus*); dans le cas de Demetrias, "L'exemple de la patronne et de la maîtresse fut suivi par la foule des clients et des domestiques (*Ep.* 130, 6, Labourt 7, p. 171; voir aussi le § 19, p. 193); Macrine persuade sa mère d'en faire de même avec les siens (*Vie*, 7, p. 165), et Olympias est accompagnée par son personnel (*Vie d'Olympias*, 6 et 8, pp. 418-420 et 422).

[6] C'est ainsi que Jérôme qualifie la vierge Eustochium (*Ep.* 22, 24, Labourt 1, p. 135); voir aussi *Ep.* 108, 6, Labourt 5, p. 163.

[7] "La première vertu des chrétiens, c'est l'humilité; Paula s'abaissait tellement que ceux qui la visitaient et étaient impatients de la voir à cause de sa célébrité et de son renom ne croyaient pas que c'était elle-même, mais *la dernière des servantes* (ultima ancillarum). Bien qu'elle fût habituellement entourée de nombreux essaims de religieuses, par son vêtement, par sa parole, son attitude et sa démarche, elle était la moindre de toutes" (*Ep.* 108, 15, Labourt 5, p. 176). Voir aussi n. 9-11.

[8] Il faut cependant ne jamais oublier que l'hyperbole et le dithyrambe sont monnaie courante dans l'hagiographie, tout comme dans les éloges funèbres ou autres (par ex. les lettres envoyées à la vierge Demetrias à l'occasion de sa consécration par Jérôme, Pélage et autres).

[9] Jérôme, *Ep.* 23, 2, Labourt 2, p. 9.

[10] *Vie d'Olympias*, 15, p. 440.

[11] Le jeu d'oppositions mérite d'être cité: "Imitentur eam multae *famulae dominam, ignobiles nobilem, fragiliter excelsae excelsius humilem*" (Augustin, *Ep.* 150, *C.S.E.L.* 44, pp. 381-382). La notion de *nobilitas* est appliquée à la vertu, et non plus au rang: Paula était "noble par la race, mais bien plus noble par la vertu" (Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 1, p. 159); de même Mélanie l'Ancienne, "noble de par ses aïeux consuls (. . .), plus noble par le mépris de la faiblesse physique" (Paulin de Nole, *Ep.* 29, 6, *C.S.E.L.* 29, p. 315). Selon les biographes, les femmes concernées avaient conscience de ce renversement: sainte Synclétique estimait qu'en matière de vertu sa haute naissance lui imposait plus de devoirs qu'aux autres (*Vie de Synclétique*, 12, pp. 25-26).

[12] Pélage, *Ep. à Demetrias*, 1, *P.L.* 30, c. 15.

[13] Après la mort d'Eustochium en 419, la direction du monastère fondé par sa mère Paula à Bethléem est reprise par Paula la Jeune. Gerontios, selon qui Mélanie la Jeune aurait joué un grand rôle dans la formation de cette dernière (sa cousine), exprime son intervention de la manière suivante: "Elle la fait passer d'un grand faste et de la mentalité romaine à une grande humilité" (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 40, p. 205).

[14] *Vie g. de Mélanie*, 11, pp. 150-151. De même, saint Martin est le seul à refuser de faire sa cour à l'Empereur Maxime (*Vie de Martin*, 20, 1, J. Fontaine, *S.C.* 133, p. 94 *sq.*).

[15] "La voici qui, foulant aux pieds la délicatesse de son éducation, la grandeur de sa richesse et le faste des dignités, en un mot tous les agréments de cette vie, n'a craint ni la faiblesse de la chair, ni la pauvreté volontaire, ni aucune de ces choses qui nous font frémir, nous" (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 12, pp. 151).

[16] *Vie de Macrine*, 7, pp. 164-165. Grégoire revient sur le sujet à propos du monastère d'Annisa: Macrine "amena sa mère à son propre degré d'humilité (ce qui signifie par définition que celle-ci n'y était pas), l'ayant disposée à se mettre au même niveau que le groupe de vierges (. . .), toute différence de rang étant supprimée de leur vie" (*ib.*, 11, p. 177).

[17] "Celui qui jouit d'une grande réputation, écrit Jean Chrysostome à Olympias, escorté

par tous, étant sur toutes les lèvres, vanté partout, s'il est tombé, entraîné dans le mépris et la médiocrité, souffrirait autant qu'un riche devenu tout à fait pauvre" (*Lettres à Olympias*, 8a, A.M. Malingrey, *S.C.* 13 bis, Paris, 1968, p. 129).

[18] "Personne, pas même l'abbesse, ne pourra posséder une esclave pour son service personnel" (Césaire d'Arles, *Règle pour les moniales*, 7, 1, A. de Vogüé, J. Courreau, *S.C.* 345, 1988, p. 187. La *Règle* date de la fin du V[e] s.). De même dans la *Règle des quatre Pères*, A. de Vogüé, 2, 35, *S.C.* 297-298, 1982, pp. 191-193. La *Règle du Maître* (VI[e] s.) stipule: "A l'esclave qui est entré en religion, il (l'abbé) ne préférera pas l'homme libre, à cause de sa naissance" (2, 18-20, A. de Voguë, *S.C.*, 105, 1964, p. 355) = *Règle de Benoît* (VI[e] s.), 2, 16-21, A. de Vogüé et J. Neufville, 1972, *S.C.* 181, 1972, pp. 444-446. C'est ainsi qu'en usait Paula avec ses moniales: "L'une d'elles était-elle noble, *on ne lui permettait pas d'avoir une femme de sa propre maison pour suivante*, par crainte qu'en souvenir du passé et d'une enfance folâtre, elle ne réveillât ses égarements d'autrefois et n'en rafraîchit la mémoire par de fréquents bavardages" (*Ep.* 108, 20, Labourt 5, p. 186). Le membre de phrase souligné (en latin: *non permittebatur de domo sua habere comitem*) est traduit par Labourt de la manière suivante: "on ne lui permettait pas d'avoir pour compagne une jeune fille provenant de sa maison"; or, même si le motif invoqué ici n'est pas la discrimination sociale, les termes *domus* et *comes* semblent bien renvoyer à la domesticité, d'autant plus que la phrase s'insère dans un développement sur les questions sociales: immédiatement après, Jérôme écrit: "Toutes étaient habillées de même" (*ibid.*).

[19] Quand Mélanie la Jeune s'enferme dans une cellule sur le Mont des Oliviers, elle a "une vierge à son service" ("μία παρθένος πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν": *Vie g. de Mélanie*, 40, p. 204). Même s'il ne s'agit plus d'une esclave, et si Mélanie n'a pas le titre d'abbesse, le privilège n'en demeure pas moins (une personne au service d'une seule autre).

[20] Augustin, *Ep.* 211, 6, *C.S.E.L.* 57, pp. 360-361 (les § 5 à 16 de cette lettre, écrite dans les années 420, contiennent une règle pour les moniales. Mais on discute pour savoir si Augustin en est vraiment l'auteur: voir L.M. Verheijen, *La règle de saint Augustin*, Paris, 1967).

[21] *Ibidem.*

[22] Césaire d'Arles, *Lettre aux moniales*, 6, 6, *S.C.* 345, p. 345.

[23] Cassien, *Institutions cénobitiques*, 11 ("de la vaine gloire"), 13, J. Cl. Guy, *S.C.* 109, Paris, 1965, p. 441 (ouvrage écrit dans les années 420). En revanche, dans un autre chapitre (4, 29, pp. 162-164), il conte l'histoire d'un homme d'une grande famille qui voulait entrer dans un monastère; pour l'éprouver, l'ancien lui commande d'aller vendre dix corbeilles, au détail uniquement. Le personnage le fit. "Nullement effrayé de la nouveauté d'un office si vil et si inusité, il ne tint pas compte de l'indignité de la chose, de la noblesse de ses origines, de l'ennui de cette vente, ne désirant qu'obtenir, par la grâce de l'obéissance, cette humilité du Christ, qui est la vraie noblesse."

[24] *La Règle du Maître*, 11, 5, *S.C.* 106, pp. 8-9: "De même que dans la maison d'un homme, le maître de céans, pour s'assurer de la bonne marche de toute chose, désigne des chefs de domestiques, que les inférieurs devront respecter comme les représentants du maître, c'est-à-dire l'intendant, le régisseur, le forestier et le majordome, de même dans les maisons divines, c'est-à-dire dans les églises et les monastères, Dieu a préposé des supérieurs aux inférieurs, il a désigné des hommes capables pour être à la tête des ignorants, des hommes avisés pour les simples, des maîtres en l'art divin pour les disciples de cet art. Dans les églises, ce sont les évêques, prêtres, diacres et clercs,

que le peuple doit respecter et écouter (. . .). Dans les monastères, ce sont les abbés et les prévots, supérieurs que l'on doit écouter pour le salut de son âme et respecter au nom de Dieu dans le service de la vie religieuse."

[25] Jérôme écrit à propos du cénobitisme pachômien (fortement hiérarchisé): "Leur acte primordial, c'est d'obéir aux Anciens, et d'exécuter tous leurs ordres" (*Ep.* 22, 35, p. 150); voir aussi *Ep.* 125, 15, pp. 126-127.

[26] *Vie l. de Mélanie*, p. 25.

[27] *La Règle du Maître* stipule que le fils d'un noble ne doit être reçu qu'"après avoir promis (. . .) tout ce qu'exige l'obéissance" (91, 1, *S.C.* 106, p. 399).

[28] A propos du monastère de saint Martin, composé de fils de famille gallo-romains, J. Fontaine parle d'un ascétisme "très charismatique et assez médiocrement hiérarchisé" (*Vie de Martin*, intr. p. 153).

[29] C'est à la suite d'une sédition des moniales contre leur abbesse qu'Augustin écrit sa fameuse lettre d'admonestation (*Ep.* 211).

[30] Voir n. 8-11.

[31] Palladius, *Histoire lausiaque*, 46, 5, p. 224.

[32] "Elle habita trois ans dans une étroite demeure, le temps de construire des cellules et des monastères, puis de fonder près de la route un abri pour les pélerins" (*Ep.* 108, 14, Labourt 5, p. 176).

[33] *Vie d'Olympias*, 6, 21, p. 418.

[34] *Vie g. de Mélanie*, 41, p. 204 (à Jérusalem). En revanche, plus tard, quand elle voulut construire un monastère d'hommes, elle était devenue trop pauvre pour cela, et ce furent des dons qui le lui permirent (*ibid.*, 49, p. 222).

[35] Voir note 4.

[36] A Rome, Marcella occupe sa propriété romaine suburbaine (note 4).

[37] C'est la maison familiale d'Annisa que Macrine transforme en monastère (*Vie de Macrine*, 11, p. 174 *sq.*).

[38] Elle et Pinien s'installent dans leur demeure de la Voie Appienne (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 7, p. 140); puis ils occupent leurs domaines de Campanie et de Sicile (Palladius, *Histoire lausiaque*, 61, 5, p. 266).

[39] A Jérusalem, elle refusa d'être la supérieure de son couvent, et remit cette fonction à une autre (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 41, p. 206).

[40] Ainsi, Paula suscite admiration et émulation par son propre exemple (*Ep.* 108, 20, Labourt 5, p. 185). Même remarque à propos de Mélanie la Jeune (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 41, p. 206).

[41] C'est sans doute la double signification que nous pouvons donner à la phrase d'Augustin, quand il écrit à propos des communautés féminines de Rome: "A leur tête se trouvent des femmes de très grande influence et de très grande estime, habiles et aptes non seulement à former et composer les mœurs, mais aussi à instruire les esprits" (*De mor. Eccl. cath.*, 1, 70, *C.S.E.L.* 90, pp. 74-75).

[42] A la mort de Paula (en 404: Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 34, Labourt 5, p. 201), sa fille Eustochium prend la direction du monastère, puis sa nièce Paula la Jeune, quelques années après la mort de cette dernière (fin 418—début 419: *Ep.* 153, Labourt 8, p. 135. Mais dans cette lettre, écrite en 422, Jérôme déclare que Paula est encore à sa charge. Une autre femme dut donc assurer l'interim); à Olympias succède sa parente Marina, puis une autre parente, Elisanthia (*Vie d'Olympias*, 10, pp. 426 et 12, p. 432).

[43] Césaire, *Règle des moniales*, 61, 1, p. 345: "Chaque fois que la sainte abbesse sera

rappelée à Dieu, aucune d'entre vous ne tentera d'en faire nommer une autre qui soit moins énergique, soit pour cause d'affection charnelle, *soit par égard pour la naissance, la fortune ou les relations familiales.*"

[44] Voir la fin du texte d'Augustin (note 41).

[45] Voir par ex. Jérôme, *Trad. de la Règle de s. Pachôme*, 51, *P.L.* 23, c. 73 C-D; Palladius, *Hist. laus.*, 33, 1-3, pp. 160-161; Augustin, *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, 1, 68, p. 73; Sulpice-Sévère, *Vie de Martin*, 10, 7, p. 274.

[46] Voir l'introduction à la *Règle des moniales* de Césaire d'Arles, pp. 70-84.

[47] C'est à cette fin qu'elle avait fait édifier des bains dans son monastère (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 41, p. 206). Les religieuses de Paula ne sortaient que le dimanche, pour aller à l'église, et en groupes uniquement; même les eunuques ne pouvaient les approcher (Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 20, Labourt 5, p. 186); l'*Ep.* 147 de Jérôme (Labourt 8, pp. 119-132) est consacrée à une moniale qui était parvenue à correspondre avec un diacre nommé Sabinianus à l'intérieur de l'église, et qui avait failli s'enfuir avec lui.

[48] Le 6 janvier 437, il reçut le baptême avant de mourir (*Vie. g. de Mélanie*, 50-56, pp. 224-238). Chastagnol admet la conversion comme un fait établi (*Le sénateur Volusien* . . ., p. 253), alors que P.R.L. Brown émet des réserves (*Aspects* . . ., p. 8).

[49] Il s'agit cette fois d'Albina, de Mélanie la Jeune et de Pinien (*Hist. laus.*, 54, 4, p. 248). En fait, ce fut seulement en 405, à la mort de son époux Publicola (*Hist. laus.*, 61, 6, p. 268) qu'Albina suivit sa fille Mélanie la Jeune (N. Moine, *Melaniana* in *RecAug* 15, 1980, p. 62).

[50] Paulin de Nole, *Ep.* 29, 12, pp. 258-259 (cité et comm. par N. Moine, *art. cit.*, pp. 39-40).

[51] *Vie. g. de Mélanie*, 40, pp. 202-204.

[52] Palladius, *Histoire lausiaque*, 55, 1, p. 250; voir N. Moine, *Melaniana*, pp. 34-35. Ces escortes sont de règle. Dans *L'aristocratie chrétienne entre Jean de Constantinople et Augustin d'Hippone, Esquisse de conclusion* in *Jean Chrysostome et Augustin, Colloque de Chantilly, Théologie Historique* 35, Paris, 1975, pp. 288-305, Ch. Pietri "a insisté à juste titre sur l'importance des relations entre l'Occident et l'Orient, à la fin du IV^{e} et au début du V^{e} s., et bien montré comment elles furent facilitées par les déplacements et les liens de parentèle des riches aristocrates" (N. Moine, *art. cit.*, p. 66, n. 330).

[53] *Ib.*, p. 228. Elle fut logée dans la luxueuse demeure du patricien Lausus (*ib.*, p. 231).

[54] *Ib.*, 58, pp. 242-244.

[55] Jérôme, *Ep.* 77, 8, Labourt 4, p. 47.

[56] Pour un résumé du conflit, lire P. Lardet, *Saint Jérôme, Apologie contre Rufin, S.C.* 303, Paris, 1983, intr., p. 24 s.

[57] Jérôme, *Ep.* 127, 9, Labourt 7, p. 144.

[58] Voir A. Chastagnol, *Les fastes* . . ., art. 65, pp. 156-158.

[59] La parenté exacte entre Avita et Mélanie n'est pas connue: voir N. Moine, *art. cit.*, pp. 27-34.

[60] Plus tard, Jérôme désignera "celle de qui le nom de noirceur atteste l'impiété ténébreuse" comme une origéniste notoire (*Ep.* 133, 3, Labourt 8, p. 53).

[61] Elle demeura en contact avec les grands évêques de son temps (*Vie d'Olympias*, 14, pp. 436-438).

[62] *Ib.*, 9, p. 425; voir Jean Chrysostome, *Lettres à Olympias*, 4, 1b, p. 98 et 6, 1e, p. 104.

[63] *Vie. g. de Mélanie*, 53, p. 232.

[64] Cf. par ex. la *Règle de Pachôme*, 3, c. 68 D; 8, c. 69 A; 28, c. 71 B; 60, c. 75 B; 139, c. 82 A); Basile de Césarée, *Règles*, qu. 7, 5, *C.S.E.L.* 86, p. 39; *Règle du Maître*, 24, 3, *S.C.* 106, pp. 122-124; c. 82 B; Augustin, *Ep.* 211, 13, *C.S.E.L.* 57, p. 368; Césaire d'Arles, *Regula ad virgines*, 17, *S.C.* 345, p. 192. Lire D. Gorce, *La lectio diuina des origines du cénobitisme à saint Benoît et à Cassiodore*, Paris, 1925.

[65] Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 20, Labourt 5, p. 185. Mélanie la Jeune en faisait de même avec les siennes (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 42, p. 208).

[66] *Ibidem.*

[67] C'est par ex. ce qu'exige Pachôme: *Règle*, 60, c. 75 B. Cependant, il n'est pas indifférent que lorsque Jérôme propose de prendre lui-même en charge l'instruction de Paula la Jeune, il s'agisse d'un membre de la famille de ses protecteurs, et non d'une petite fille quelconque (*Ep.* 107, 1, Labourt 5, p. 145. Au § 4, p. 149, il se réclame de l'exemple d'Aristote, précepteur d'Alexandre!). L'autre traité de pédagogie constitué par la lettre 128 (Labourt 7, pp. 148-154) est aussi adressé à une noble.

[68] Voir E. Cantarella, *L'Ambiguo malanno: condizione e imagine della donna nell' antichità greca e romana, Universale Scienze sociali* 39, Rome, 1985, p. 103 *sq.*

[69] Jérôme, *Commentaire sur l'Epître aux Ephésiens*, 2, *prol.*, 3, P.L. 26 (1845), c. 477 A; *Commentaire sur l'Epître aux Galates, prol., ibid.*, c. 307 B-308 A.

[70] "Elle savait par cœur l'Ecriture, commente-t-il, et si j'hésitais en quelque endroit, si j'avouais ingénument mon ignorance, elle ne voulait pas du tout se rendre à mon avis, mais ses interrogations continuelles me contraignaient à lui indiquer quelle opinion, parmi le grand nombre de celles qui étaient valables, me semblait la plus probable" (*Ep.* 108, 26, Labourt 5, p. 195).

[71] Mélanie la Jeune était "amie des lettres" (*Vie. g. de Mélanie*, 21, p. 170); elle connaissait aussi bien le grec que le latin, et elle s'était fixée pour chaque jour d'abondantes lectures (*ib.*, 26, p. 180); son savoir en théologie était si large que "*beaucoup de femmes de sénateurs*, et d'autres personnages *des plus brillants par la culture*, venaient chez notre sainte mère, discuter avec elle de la foi orthodoxe" (*ib.*, 54, p. 232).

[72] Macrine, "lorsqu'elle eut passé la prime enfance, assimilait facilement ce que l'on enseigne aux enfants, et quelle que fût la matière que ses parents décidaient de lui faire étudier, les dispositions de la jeune enfant s'y manifestaient avec éclat" (Grégoire de Nysse, *Vie. de Macrine*, 3, p. 149).

[73] Cela se fit en compagnie d'un groupe de vierges et de veuves réunies autour d'elles (*Ep.* 45, 2 et 7, Labourt 2, pp. 97 et 100).

[74] *Ep.* 59, Labourt 3, pp. 85-90. Des nombreuses lettres envoyées à Marcella après la période romaine, c'est la seule qui nous soit parvenue.

[75] Ainsi, en 389-392, les Commentaires sur *Nahum, Sophonie et Aggée* s'adressent explicitement à elles (*C.C.L.* 76 A, pp. 526, 655 et 713).

[76] *Vie g. de Mélanie*, 54, p. 233.

[77] Paula: *Ep.* 108, 1, Labourt 5, p. 159; Mélanie l'Ancienne: *Ep.* 45, 4, Labourt 2, p. 98; Mélanie la Jeune: *Vie g. de Mélanie*, par ex. 11, p. 146; Macrine: *Vie de Macrine*, 5, pp. 158-160; Olympias: *Vie d'Olympias*, 5, pp. 414-418 et 7, p. 420.

[78] On prend pour modèle le dénuement du Christ (lieu commun chez les Pères: J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire romain*, Paris, 1933, pp. 338-339). *Règle du Maître*, 82, 161, *S.C.* 106, pp. 87 et 338; Jérôme, *De uiris illustribus*, *P.L.* 23, c. 658 B; *Règle de Pachôme, Praef.*, c. 66 B, repris dans la règle 81, c. 77 A; Augustin, *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, 1, 67, p. 72.

[79] Césaire, *Règle des moniales*, 6, 6, pp. 317-319: "Si vous êtes nobles de naissance (. . .), distribuez votre fortune terrestre de telle sorte que, là où vous pouvez avoir des ailes spirituelles en les distribuant vite et bien, vous n'ayez point des entraves charnelles en gardant quelque chose pour vous ou en donnant trop tard" = *Règle du Maître*, 91, 10, *S.C.* 106, p. 400; *Règle des quatre Pères*, 2, 29, *S.C.* 297, p. 190.

[80] *Ep.* 108, 20, Labourt 5, p. 186. Il s'agit là d'une règle de la vie monastique: quand Malchus se prend à soupirer après une vie de cénobite, il déclare désirer un lieu "où l'on travaille pour la communauté, où rien n'appartient en propre à quiconque, et où tout est à tous" (*Vie de Malchus*, 7, *P.L.* 23 <1883>, c. 59 D-60 A).

[81] Le ch. 91 de la *Règle du Maître*, *S.C.* 106, p. 398 *sq.*, intitulé "Comment on doit recevoir au monastère le fils d'un noble," demande aux parents de donner tout ou partie des biens au monastère = ch. 58 de la *Règle de Benoît* (*S.C.* 182, pp. 634-638), intitulé "Des fils nobles ou de pauvres qui sont offerts."

[82] Dans les *Institutions cénobitiques* (4, 4, p. 126), Cassien dit que les moines égyptiens refusent l'argent des postulants, "pour éviter que la vanité qu'ils en tirent leur fasse mépriser leurs frères pauvres, mais aussi pour qu'ils ne redemandent pas l'argent au cas où ils décideraient de renoncer à la vie monastique"; voir aussi *ib.*, 7, 27, p. 328.

[83] Ainsi, Martyria et Palladia, les sœurs d'Olympias, "donnent d'avance à ce saint monastère tout ce qui leur appartenait"; de même pour Olympias, sa parente Elisanthia, et "plusieurs autres femmes de famille sénatoriale" (*Vie d'Olympias*, 6, p. 148). Les vierges, elles, étaient souvent dotées: Antoine l'avait prévu pour sa sœur (Athanase, *Vie d'Antoine*, 2, 5, *S.C.* 400, p. 134), et Proba pour Demetrias (Jérôme, *Ep.* 130, 7, Labourt 7, p. 173).

[84] "Que celles d'entre vous qui avaient des biens dans le monde, lorsqu'elles sont entrées dans le monastère, consentent à ce qu'ils deviennent le bien de tous (. . .). Que celles qui occupaient quelque rang dans le monde ne méprisent pas celles qui, de pauvres qu'elles étaient, sont, par une sainte union, devenues leurs sœurs. Qu'elles se glorifient moins de la dignité et des richesses de leurs parents que de la société de leurs compagnes pauvres. Qu'elles ne tirent pas vanité d'avoir contribué au bien-être de la communauté, et qu'elles ne s'enorgueillissent pas plus de leurs richesses données au monastère, que si elles en jouissaient dans le monde (. . .) A quoi sert de distribuer ses biens aux pauvres et de devenir pauvre soi-même, si notre âme met plus d'orgueil dans le mépris que dans la possession des richesses" (*Ep.* 211, 5-6, pp. 360-361). Dans ce même passage, Augustin demande également aux moniales pauvres de ne pas concevoir d'orgueil parce qu'elles côtoient des femmes qui possédaient des richesses). Pélage déclare d'ailleurs à Demetrias que sa richesse passée exige une constante vigilance (*Ep.* à Demetrias, 25, *P.L.* 30, c. 39 B).

[85] Voir n. 31-34.

[86] Mélanie l'Ancienne recevait régulièrement de l'argent de sa famille et de ses intendants (Palladius, *Histoire lausiaque*, 54, 2, p. 246). La fin de vie de Mélanie la Jeune est jalonnée de fondations (monastères, églises) qui impliquent la conservation d'une partie au moins des biens réalisés (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 41, 48-49, 57-58, pp. 204-206, 218-222, 240-244). Paula continue aussi à donner (Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 2, Labourt 5, p. 160), et le *diuersorium* de Bethléem, qui accueille et aide les réfugiés (*Ep.* 66, 14, Labourt 3, p. 180), nécessite des fonds. Macrine vint en aide aux pauvres lors de la famine survenue en Cappadoce dans les années 368-369 (*Vie de Macrine*, 26, p. 232), et Olympias est louée pour ses dons constants (*Vie d'Olympias*, 13, p. 434).

[87] Demetrias: Jérôme, *Ep.* 130, 13, Labourt 7, p. 183; Eustochium: *Ep.* 22, 29, Labourt 1, p. 143.

[88] Pachôme: Jérôme, *Ep.* 22, 35, Labourt 1, p. 151; Basile: *Règles*, qu. 66, 68 et 69, pp. 102, 104-105); Syrie: A.J. Festugière, Antioche *païenne et chrétienne*, Paris, 1959, pp. 317-318; A. Guillaumont, *Aux origines du monachisme chrétien: pour une phénoménologie du monachisme*, "Spiritualité orientale" 30, Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1979, pp. 117-126.

[89] Les religieuses pachômiennes travaillaient (elles avaient "la même constitution et les mêmes observances" que les hommes: *Histoire lausiaque*, 33, 1, p. 160). En Syrie, dans les monastères de femmes, on travaillait au filage (Théodoret de Cyr, *Histoire religieuse*, 30, 4, *S.C.* 259, p. 244). Dans le décours du IV[e] s., les vierges qui vivaient ensemble à Bologne travaillaient (Ambroise, *De uirginibus*, 1, 60, *P.L.* 16, c. 205 B).

[90] Jérôme, *Ep.* 108, 20, Labourt 5, p. 185.

[91] A Marmoutier, dont la majorité des moines étaient nobles, "on n'exerçait aucun art, à l'exception du travail des copistes" (*Vie de Martin*, 10, 6, p. 274; comm. de J. Fontaine, *S.C.* 134, p. 676 *sq.*). Jean Cassien regrette que ses moines, composés surtout de nobles, ne veuillent pas travailler (*De Inst. Coen.*, pp. 420-422). Les Messaliens en particulier n'acceptaient que la contemplation. C'est notamment contre eux qu'Epiphane de Salamine s'insurgea en 374-377 dans son *Panarion* et qu'Augustin rédigea le *De opere monachorum* en 400 (celui-ci n'en plaide pas moins l'indulgence envers des hommes qui, "éduqués dans trop de mollesse, ne peuvent endurer la fatigue des tâches corporelles": § 25, *C.S.E.L.* 41, p. 570).

[92] *Ep.* 22, 31, Labourt 1, p. 146. Jérôme ne lui donne aucune recommendation portant sur le travail manuel (mais il faut préciser qu'en 384, Estochium vit encore—bien que retirée—dans le palais de sa mère). Ambroise n'en donnait pas non plus en 377, dans son *De uirginibus*: Dans *L'originalité du De uirginibus dans le mouvement ascétique occidental: Ambroise, Cyprien, Athanase* in *Ambroise de Milan. XVI[e] centenaire de son élection épiscopale*, Paris, 1974, pp. 56-57, Y.M. Duval fait remarquer que les vierges auxquelles s'adresse l'ouvrage semblent surtout des femmes riches, et que s'il est recommandé à Marcellina (sœur d'Ambroise) de faire varier les occupations ("lectione, *opere*, prece": 3, 16), "aucune règle n'est donnée concernant ce travail." Mais la règle du travail manuel était déjà connue à Rome: à l'automne 384, une vierge nommée Asella (qui vivait dans une cellule) s'y livrait (Jérôme *Ep.* 24, 4, Labourt 2, p. 12); le *De uiduis* d'Ambroise loue les veuves qui travaillent de leurs mains: il s'agit de veuves pauvres (*De uiduis*, 5, 31, *P.L.* 16, c. 244 A-B).

[93] Jérôme, *Ep.* 66, 13, Labourt, pp. 179-180. L'Occident suit l'exemple de l'Orient: à la fin du IV[ème] s., Augustin dit que, dans les monastères de Rome, on travaille de ses mains "à la manière de l'Orient et selon le précepte de Paul" (*De Moribus*, 33, 70, p. 75); il mentionne "les nombreuses veuves et vierges qui habitent ensemble et qui cherchent à subsister par le travail de la laine et du tissu" (*ib.*). Jérôme témoigne de cette évolution (voir n. 94).

[94] "La femme que l'on conduit à son époux ne sera astreinte à aucun autre service que le travail de la laine" (Plutarque, *Vie de Romulus* 15, 5, Flacelière, *CUF*, p. 77); dans les *Aetia Rom.* 284 F, Titchener, pp. 321, 28-29, il est précisé que les Sabines que les Romains prennent pour épouses "ne seront astreintes ni à moudre le grain, ni à faire la cuisine." En 400, Jérôme écrit à Laeta à propos de sa fille Paula, qui va entrer dans le monastère de sa grand-mère Paula et de sa tante Eustochium: "Qu'elle apprenne aussi à filer la laine, à manier la quenouille, à assujettir le panier sur ses genoux, à

faire tourner le fuseau, à guider les fils avec le pouce" (*Ep.* 107, 10, Labourt 5, p. 154); de même pour la petite Pacatula en 413 (*Ep.* 128, 1, Labourt 7, p. 149), et en 414 pour la vierge Demetrias (*Ep.* 130, 15, Labourt 7, pp. 186-187).

[95] "*Vaillantes par rapport à leur état de jadis*, elles préparent les lampes, ou bien elles allument le foyer, balaient le pavé, épluchent les légumes, agencent en bouquet les herbes potagères, puis les jettent dans la marmite; elles disposent les tables, présentent les coupes, distribuent largement les mets. *Ne pourraient-elles pas en obliger d'autres à s'acquitter de ces services?*" (*Ep.* 66, 13, Labourt 3, p. 180). Cette information est sans doute authentique, mais il faut ajouter que l'éloge des tâches les plus pénibles revient régulièrement dans l'hagiographie: la vierge Candide, fille du commandant Trajan, travaillait à la meule (Palladius, *Hist. laus.*, 57, 2, p. 254); Macrine veillait sur sa mère "en préparant souvent le pain de ses propres mains" (*Vie de Macrine*, 5, pp. 158-159; *cf. ib.*, p. 49, n. 1). On imagine mieux les aristocrates dédiées à une vie d'étude et de contemplation (Mélanie la Jeune: *Vie g. de Mélanie*, 21, 23, 26, 27, 33, 37, pp. 170, 174, 178, 180, 188, 196), à l'instar des moines de saint Martin (*Vie de Martin*, 10, 8, *S.C.* 133, pp. 274-279).

[96] "Si l'on examinait les circonstances (. . .), que c'était un corps féminin, et par ailleurs délicat, à cause de la situation en vue et du luxe de vos parents, quel océan de merveilles, si on les révélait une à une!" (Jean Chrysostome, *Lettres à Olympias*, 8c, p. 124); cf. aussi 8b, p. 132 (gloire de la femme riche qui accepte les haillons).

[97] *Vie g. de Mélanie*, 31, pp. 186-188. A Constantinople, le seigneur Lausus fait le même commentaire à propos de son austérité et de sa pauvreté (*ib.*, 53, p. 230), et l'impératrice Serena prend en pitié son pauvre habit (*ib.*, 12, p. 148). La difficulté de Pinien à abandonner ses riches atours est expliquée par son passé d'élégance et de délicatesse (*ib.*, 8, p. 140). Sulpice Sévère écrit de son côté: "Bon nombre (de moines de s. Martin) s'habillaient de poils de chameaux. On y tenait pour une faute grave une tenue plus raffinée. Cela doit être considéré comme d'autant plus extraordinaire qu'il y avait parmi eux, disait-on, un grand nombre de nobles; ayant reçu une éducation toute différente, ils s'étaient volontairement pliés à cette vie d'humilité et de mortification" (*Vie de Martin*, 10, 8, p. 275).

[98] Pélage, *Ep. à Demetrias*, 1, c. 15 D et 16 A.

[99] Une fois à Jérusalem, Mélanie renforce son ascèse (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 40, pp. 202-204).

[100] "Si nous entreprenons une ascèse qui dépasse nos forces, disaient-ils, notre corps, impuissant à supporter ces durs traitements à cause de la mollesse de notre genre de vie, se débilitera tout à fait, et nous risquons de nous abandonner par la suite à la sensualité" (*Vie g. de Mélanie*, 9, p. 142). Ce propos sur la nécessité du *ne quid nimis* n'est pas rare dans le discours monastique: *Vie de Synclétique*, 19, pp. 28-29; Jérôme, *Ep.* 107, 10, Labourt 5, p. 155.

[101] *Ep.* 211, 9. Il ajoute: "Qu'elles ne trouvent donc pas mauvais ce que l'on fait de plus pour les autres, comme une marque, *non d'honneur, mais de tolérance.* Ce serait un grand malheur pour une moniale si, *tandis que des femmes riches supportent les fatigues et les labeurs autant que leur santé le permet*, les pauvres y devenaient delicates" (*ib.*). Césaire d'Arles, *Règle pour les moniales*, 30, p. 210: "Il est du devoir de la sainte abbesse de faire venir du vin de qualité, apte à réconforter les malades *ou celles qui ont reçu une éducation plus raffinée*"; *ib.*, 42, p. 224: "S'il est des sœurs *qui ont reçu une éducation plus raffinée* ou souffrent fréquemment de maux d'estomac, et qui par suite ne peuvent pratiquer

l'abstinence comme les autres ou ne jeûnent qu'avec beaucoup de peine, si la timidité les empêche de demander le nécessaire, faites-le leur donner par les cellérières et commandez-leur d'accepter. Qu'elles soient bien sûres que c'est le Christ qu'elles reçoivent dans ces ménagements qu'on leur accorde."

37000 *Tours*, 10, rue du Courset, France

VALENTINUS POETA: NOTES ON ΘΕΡΟΣ*

BY

ANDREW MCGOWAN

Introduction

The terrain of Valentinian studies has changed somewhat with the publication of Christoph Markschies's *Valentinus Gnosticus?*.[1] Close examination of the fragments attributed to Valentinus and resistance to reading back the reports of heresiologists or the systems of later Valentinians have led Markschies to question the "Gnosticism" of the supposed Gnostic heresiarch. If Markschies ultimately adopts a sort of agnosticism as to the real position of Valentinus, it is a robust one which runs against the current of recent research and the tendency to read the fragments with what may now seem to be an unwarranted inter-textuality, whether in the traditional form of concern with orthodox doctrinal history[2] or in terms of comparison with the library of Nag Hammadi.[3]

While Markschies has not won the debate, the center has certainly shifted, and the more serious consideration given by him to the fragments of Valentinus' writings seems to be the example for research to follow in the near future.[4] Nevertheless, the value of a hermeneutical separation of Valentinus from Gnosticism cannot dispense entirely with the need to consider how he "became" Gnostic. Whether the disjuncture between the reports and the fragments represents an esoteric tradition, a personal change, or the transformation of his tradition by followers, some link must be provided to the emergence of the fulsome theological systems already well-known to Irenaeus.[5] There is therefore more room for discussion of the writings of Valentinus themselves after Markschies's massive contribution, rather than less; but careful attention must be given both to the likely original contexts and meanings, and to the readings and reception that followed soon after.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Θέρος

The *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* of Hippolytus contains a poem which is unique among the remnants of Valentinus; not so much a fragment as a complete, if tiny, work.[6]

Θέρος	Harvest
Πάντα κρεμάμενα πνεύματι βλέπω	All things hanging in spirit I see,
πάντα δ' ὀχούμενα πνεύματι νοῶ	All things carried in spirit I know;
σάρκα μὲν ἐκ ψυχῆς κρεμαμένην	flesh from soul hanging,
ψυχὴν δ' ἀέρος ἐξεχομένην	soul from air proceeding,
ἀέρα δ' ἐξ αἴθρης κρεμάμενον	air from ether hanging.
ἐκ δὲ βυθοῦ καρποὺς φερομένους	Fruit borne from the deep,
ἐκ μήτρας δὲ βρέφος φερόμενον.[7]	Child borne from the womb.

Although form or genre might hint at the purpose of such a work, in this case the clues are of a subtle nature at best. The poem or hymn, whose title could be rendered "Harvest" or "Summer" or both,[8] observes the conventions of Greek meter.[9] The poem indicates some literary skill, but avoids more traditional or "high" classical forms still being used by others in this period.[10] Its dactylic tetrameter uses traditional components, but in an unusual combination, and the "mouse-tail" endings of each line (iambs instead of dactyls or spondees) are also notable. There are many hexameter verses using "mouse-tails" (individual lines are found even in Homer) but whole works are few in number, and the uses of these extant "mouse-tail" hexameters vary, as does modern judgement on their literary merits.[11] A pair of "mouse-tailed" acrostic song-texts from the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (*P. Oxy.* 15 and 1795) which deal in popular wisdom have been called sea-shanties or drinking songs.[12] The *Tragopodagra* of Lucian uses the meter in a satirical choral section (313-25).[13] An early Christian hymn of uncertain date, *De Moribus Christianorum*, also uses "mouse-tails,"[14] and Annianus, a contemporary of Valentinus, wrote *Fescinnini*, a type of bawdy Latin verse, in dactylic tetrameter.[15]

The form of the work therefore exemplifies general trends in poetry in the period rather than revealing much about its origins or purpose.[16] T.F. Higham suggested that "mouse-tailed" verses have both tragic intensity and a certain vulgarity;[17] they may have been thought of as somewhat inspirational or at least emotive. It seems possible that Valentinus was consciously avoiding formality (while remaining within the rules of meter) and hence crafting a work capable of popular use, perhaps in terms reminiscent of the strategy later said to have been employed by Arius, among others.[18] The dactylic mouse-tails do seem to have been intended for

singing.[19] Hippolytus' description of the work as ψαλμός, taken in its simplest sense, would also support the idea that this is not merely a poem but a song.[20]

Despite its designation as a "psalm," the relation of the hymn to the Biblical psalms is not especially helpful for comparison or interpretation.[21] There is a kind of poetic parallelism in parts of Valentinus' hymn not unlike that of the Hebrew Psalms, but parallelism is not unknown in Greek poetry either. We know too little of hymnody in second century Christianity to make confident statements about the possibility of specific use, such as in liturgy. The indications are that Valentinus had no wholly-separate organization, but participated in the assemblies of what we might, risking anachronism, call orthodox Christianity.[22] The enigmatic content of the hymn poses a problem for consideration of its purpose or setting, as otherwise: its obscurity invites speculation as to some hidden meaning, but also makes wider use in Christian assemblies less likely.[23]

The *Odes of Solomon* have also been attributed to Valentinus, since he is said to have written "psalms," and the content of the *Odes* has been compared with the heresiological accounts of Valentinus' teaching and with the *Gospel of Truth*, also widely (and even more over-confidently) attributed to Valentinus.[24] This speculative connection is to be resisted as a means of interpretation, given both the lack of positive evidence for the hypothesis and the acknowledged need to consider the works of Valentinus in some degree of critical separation even from other Valentinian sources.

The Meaning of the Hymn

Hippolytus conveys an interpretation of the hymn, apparently the Valentinians' exegesis but not necessarily Valentinus' own:

> "Flesh" is matter, according to them, which is hung from the soul by the demiurge. "Soul" proceeds from "air"; this means that the demiurge proceeds from the spirit, outside the pleroma. "Air" appears from "ether"; this means Sophia, which is outside the boundary and appears from the pleroma inside [the boundary]. "Fruits" are borne from the "deep"; that is, the whole projection of aeons comes into being from the Father (*Ref.* 6.37.8).

This seems unlikely to represent the author, is at best incomplete and garbled, and quite possibly a rather later interpretation. There remains, however, the question of whether some (other) sort of allegorizing or even mystical approach best reveals the meaning of the hymn,[25] or whether on the other hand the hymn is to be interpreted more literally and concretely

as a "hymn of praise to the creator through the creation," lauding the process of birth and the provision of foods and fruits.[26] These may not be the only alternatives, but they seem to represent the two poles between which the previous scholarly opinions can be arranged.

The poem is preceded by the title Θέρος.[27] The importance of names is one thing about which we can be reasonably clear in Valentinus. In one fragment (*fr.* 5)[28] he compares the relationship between a portrait and the living face from which it is taken to that between (this) world and the "living aeon." The deficiency which exists in the "copies," i.e., in both the portrait and the present world, is made up for by "the name." In that metaphor, the name is at least equivalent to the title of the portrait, although it may mean rather more than that. Names are also prominent in *fragment* 1,[29] the account of angelic involvement in creation used as a comparison with human experience of works of art, especially those made "in the name of a god." Adam was similarly made "in the name of the pre-existing human being." Thus "the name" of a creature seems to be its true essence and power, given from outside.[30]

The name of the hymn itself might then be something rather more than incidental or purely descriptive, but might "complete the lack" that plagues a "modeled form" or "portrait" or any work of art, including perhaps a poem. For the moment, however, it seems important to consider the poem itself as artefact before determining how the title might complete a lack of understanding.

Seeing and Knowing

The interpretation of the first two lines of the hymn has great bearing on how we understand the whole. Their parallelism suggests some comparison and perhaps contrast, but what degree and kind of agreement or difference must be determined by a closer examination of the whole. It seems in any case that κρεμάμενα and ὀχούμενα have directly contrasted meanings, since one participle implies suspension from above, the other support from below. Markschies, seeking the kind of restatement of one line in the next characteristic of many Hebrew psalms, proposes two different spirits which frame "all things": one, the "'obere,' göttliche Pneuma" and another the "tragende, untere Pneuma." This view is based on traditions such as that found in the Wisdom of Solomon, in which the Spirit of God is spoken of as all-pervasive, as well as on some philosophical parallels.[31] If this interpretation is to be followed, "all things," creation, is considered

from two perspectives, and the two lines are basically synonymous.[32] The remainder of the hymn then describes the created order in more detail, expanding upon the meaning of the "all."

Another possibility is to consider the differences between the parallel first lines as substantial rather than merely as literary restatement.[33] The most obvious reason for doing so is that, granted the synonymity of "sight" and "knowledge" in some mystical (including Gnostic) texts, there remains the unlikelihood that physical "seeing" and intellectual "knowing" would be the same thing for a Middle-Platonizing exegete. Since poetic parallelism does not necessarily direct the reader to restatement rather than contrast, this possibility of interpretation ought at least to be considered seriously.

If "knowledge" and "sight" are two different faculties rather than merely a variation of imagery, then it follows that what is seen and what is known are two different things, or at least two different aspects of reality, rather than just two ways of talking about the same thing. The importance of νοῦς in Platonic and Stoic traditions suggests a clear epistemic hierarchy in which knowledge is superior to sense-perception. While Valentinus speaks of "seeing" all that "hangs" (from or in spirit), he "knows" what "is borne" (by or in spirit).[34] The ideas of being "hung" and being "borne" are found in various cosmological texts, including Platonic dialogues, referring to arrangement of the elements, but it is hard to be sure of a precise significance for later interpreters. It is at least possible that the use of ὀχούμενα suggests the arrangement of divine "elements," rather than of the physical ones which are "hung."[35] Such a distinction between two "alls," one accessible to sight, the other accessible only to knowledge or reason, should be an uncontroversial thing to attribute to Valentinus, whether derived from Gnostic texts, heresiologists, or from the fragments themselves.

It must be granted that the fragment on Valentinus' vision of a baby (*fr.* 7)[36] uses the language of sight rather than of knowledge, as does that on the state of the heart (*fr.* 2), which ends with a promise of vision of God.[37] On the other hand, in at least two other fragments (*frs.* 1 and 5) there is a contrast between visible image and higher reality, and specifically between the "world" and the "living realm."[38] Interestingly, these fragments are the same two already mentioned with regard to names and their significance. The analogy of the portrait and the face uses a hierarchical contrast between visible and invisible; the "living realm" and the sense-perceptible world are both likened and distinguished by analogy with the relation of a face to its portrait; one sight available to only a limited set

of viewers, compared to a lesser one that is more generally accessible. An enigmatic "invisible" something (a name perhaps?) "co-operates with the molded form for faith" (*fr.* 5). Likewise the angels of *fragment* 1 fear the human form precisely because of an "invisible" gift of a seed from above. It therefore seems likely that the contrast between "I see" and "I know" was a significant one for Valentinus, rather than being only a matter of synonyms and literary restatement.[39] This differentiation can be likened to Philo's distinction between αἴσθησις and νοῦς, and even the terminology suggests parallels between the two Alexandrian philosopher-exegetes.[40]

If the "things hanging" are seen and the "things borne" are unseen, the former are the visible elements of the universe, and the latter are transcendent realities accessible by different means such as contemplation. In the light of Valentinus' other writings alone it is reasonable to proceed on the basis that the main verbs of the first two lines suggest different perceptions of the "world" and the "living realm" respectively.

In Spirit

Some previous commentators have sought definitively to resolve the ambiguity of πνεύματι ("in spirit"). While grammatically it seems clearly preferable to link the spirit to the participles, and one could therefore translate "I see all things hanging on spirit" or similarly,[41] it is possible to be unhelpfully precise. "Spirit" may somehow refer both to the subjective aspect of the main verbs (hence "I see in spirit") as well as to the arrangement of the "alls."[42] Valentinus speaks of a vision of the Logos (*fr.* 7),[43] which is the clearest basis we have for thinking that his theology was somehow based on visionary experience, easily understandable as "in the Spirit."[44]

If the subjective aspect is obvious enough—that there is some sense in which the insight of the poet is "spiritual"—the objective is more difficult, even if better-founded grammatically. If some things "hang in spirit" while others are "borne on spirit," the spirit seems to be between the two "alls"; spirit is the divider between two halves of what is, an epistemic firmament beyond which perhaps only some may pass.[45] There are instances in related texts of spirit as an intermediary stratum or as "upper atmosphere" beyond which there is the divine world, e.g., in *Poimandres* (1.5; cf. 1.9, 1.16).[46] Middle Platonist cosmology in general might be expected to see spirit as coming from and tending towards the upper world, as well as being mixed in with all things.[47] Therefore the things open to sense-perception are those

which hang down below spirit, and those open to knowledge are those which are supported above spirit.

There is also some use in comparing later Valentinian approaches to "spirit" with this suggestion of an element intermediary between sense-perceptible and intellectual (or spiritual) realms. Irenaeus' reports on Ptolemy's system and that attributed to Valentinus suggest that the Holy Spirit is understood as a guardian or boundary to the Pleroma. Irenaeus says that for Ptolemy, after all the aeons of the Pleroma were constituted there was a further pair, "Christ and Holy Spirit" (*Adv. Haer.* 1.2.5-6), brought forth "to fortify and strengthen the Pleroma." The Holy Spirit in particular had the role of bringing the aeons to a "true state of rest." Further, the figure of Achamoth, from whose action the material world arises is also designated "Holy Spirit" and is adjacent to Boundary (Ὅρος; *Adv. Haer.* 1.4.1). What Irenaeus calls Valentinus' own position in *Adversus Haereses* 1.11 also posits the Holy Spirit (without a direct pairing with Christ, suggesting a less developed version of the system than Ptolemy's) as produced by Truth after the Pleroma "for the inspection and fructification of the Aeons" (1.11.1).

It is not necessary to think that Valentinus' hymn presumes the whole of such a system in order to see that the parallels might support the kind of interpretation suggested here; in fact it would be difficult to reconcile them fully. Nevertheless, Irenaeus' descriptions could well be understood as evolving from one in which "spirit" is understood as located beyond the upper atmosphere, or perhaps even hypostatized as a mediating power.

The Chain of Being

The middle three lines of the hymn seem more straightforward.[48] Valentinus describes the arrangement of the elements flesh, soul, air and ether in an upward movement; this arrangement might be an unremarkable use of contemporary cosmological descriptions,[49] granted that the great chain of being seems to start with humanity, rather than with the physical elements such as water and earth.[50] In terms of the contrasting interpretations just suggested for the opening lines, these would be "all things hanging."[51] Markschies suggests that Valentinus draws upon a tradition of interpretation of *Iliad* 8.17-27, where Zeus uses the image of a "Golden Chain" to illustrate his power.[52] The picture given of this physical world is, in any case, one of continuity rather than of harsh dualism. Although

the language of "flesh" and "spirit" is used, no greater distinction is placed between these two than any of the other elements.[53]

Exclusion of a radically dualistic picture of the cosmos does not necessarily place Valentinus at a far remove from his disciples. In his *Letter to Flora* even Ptolemy emphasizes that his own understanding is monistic, and that the emergence of what is less than perfect from what is perfectly good is at the center of his teaching, the "apostolic tradition" (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 33.7.8-9). This position, as well as that of the poem, are to be sharply distinguished from the radical dichotomies presented by some Valentinian texts and accounts.[54]

Fruit from the Deep; Child from the Womb

If the middle section of the poem was an expansion on the πάντα κρεμάμενα of line 1, how are we to understand the last part, the final two lines? The options suggested by Markschies for the understanding of this section are helpful: first, there is the possibility of a literal reference to the fruitfulness of the created order; second, βυθός and μήτρα may be the highest God and the Spirit; third, they may be drawn from an existing Gnostic cosmology that Valentinus has taken over.[55] The last two may not be altogether exclusive.

The structure and language of the poem itself must be the starting point. The use of φερομένους and φερόμενον in these final lines seems to provide a parallel with the second; here as elsewhere φέρω and ὀχέω may be synonymous.[56] Hence just as the middle three lines are an expansion upon the first, these last two may expand upon the πάντα δ'ὀχούμενα of line 2. If the things "hanging" were the world of sense-perception, the things "seen in" and/or "borne upon" spirit would be the "living realm," the spiritual realities inaccessible to sense-perception.[57]

Hence the final lines are probably to be understood in some speculative or even mystical sense; as a sort of extension of cosmological description, "upward" beyond the visible. This already means that the first, more literal interpretation espoused by Markschies is ruled out. Of course this and other approaches are not inherently impossible, since the hitherto varied interpretations of the poem urge circumspection about bold claims to self-evident meaning. Yet the more literal interpretation seems implausible in any case. On that view, the whole hymn praises the creator through the creation; having scaled the heights of the natural order, the poetry moves from a description of the static elements to the dynamic events of

life and reproduction, the growth of plants and the birth of children. Yet no spiritual discernment is necessary to repeat philosophical commonplaces, let alone to describe animal or vegetable reproduction. Markschies defends the possibility that in the hymn the highest, indescribable God is praised through what can be spoken of, in terms of a *via negativa*, but the implication of confining speech regarding the creator to the visible world seems an exaggeration of what we might expect from Middle-Platonist exegesis, and is far less than appears in the other fragments of Valentinus.[58]

It is these authentic writings which again suggest that the onus of proof should be on those who would dispute a mythological or at least speculative interpretation. Hippolytus records that a fundamental part of Valentinus' system was his visionary experience of a child (*fr.* 7).[59] Apart from the fact that this child immediately evokes the last line of the hymn, the mystical nature of that piece of evidence on Valentinus' beliefs provides not only a similarity in content, but a link in the kind of experience involved.[60] The child of line 7 may therefore, as many others have suggested, tentatively be identified as the Logos.

The fragments of Valentinus themselves give us reason, therefore, to think there is a mythological and at least somewhat dualistic aspect to the poem and to these closing lines in particular. Such an explanation is more promising, both because the interpretation already presented for the first two lines suggests "higher" realities, and since they give us reason to imagine why someone would actually want to write or sing this hymn in the context of a Christian community (or at all). This is not to say, however, that it contains or expresses a Valentinian system.

Harvest, Roots and Fruits

Although they may well be seen as related, there is no other reference to "harvest" or to "fruits" (or to "deep" or "womb") among the fragments of Valentinus. This makes it difficult to interpret the "fruit" of the next-to-last line, as well as the title, which I have already suggested might well be of more than passing importance as the "name," perhaps even "completing the lack" of the work. At this point it therefore seems worthwhile to look a little more broadly for comparisons, and even to consider the relation between these images and those in texts giving evidence of Gnostic positions. Yet as Markschies has argued, an interpretation of Valentinus in general terms of a Platonizing tendency in Christianity is preferable. It would not be surprising for a "Platonizing theologian" to use Platonist

cosmology in his system, and this may be just what Valentinus does in line 6.[61]

In the *Timaeus* (90a) the placement of the soul is presented as evidence that human beings are "plants" of heavenly "root":

> . . . God has given to each of us . . . that kind of soul which is housed in the top of our body and which raises us—seeing that we are not an earthly but a heavenly plant (φυτόν)—up from earth toward our kindred in the heaven. And herein we speak most truly; for it is by suspending (ἀνακρεμαννύν) our head and root (ῥίζαν) from that region whence the substance of our soul first came that the Divine Power keeps upright our whole body.[62]

The idea of a divine root is also used by later philosophical writers, and once again it would be very difficult to draw specific lines of dependence and influence except to say that the idea has a tradition of interpretation.[63] It would not be surprising to find this tradition somehow extended into Valentinus' teaching or that of his followers.

For the followers, at least, it is in fact not hard to trace. In Irenaeus' description of the system of Ptolemy (*Adv. Haer.* 1.1-9), the language of bearing fruit is applied repeatedly to the emanations of that myth.[64] "Fruit" language also appears in the briefer consideration of what is described as Valentinus' own teaching (1.11.1) and of the doctrine of Secundus (1.11.2). Irenaeus makes extended use of a particular horticultural image—the growing of curcubit vegetables—in pouring scorn upon the myths of emanations (1.11.4). This does draw upon a widespread ancient tradition of abuse, but is also clearly meant as a parody of the "fruit" language he has been describing.[65] The metaphor also makes a brief but suggestive appearance at the end of Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora* (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 33.7.10).[66]

"Fruit" and an "inverted root" image are prominent in the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth*: in contrast with the upward growth of (ordinary) plants, "fruit" comes forth from a "root" which is above (41.23-40; 42.33).[67] Likewise the *Tripartite Tractate* uses the metaphor in relation to its own scheme of the aeons, speaking of them as fruit coming down from a divine root.[68] The verbal echo in the reference of the *Timaeus* to "suspending" or "hanging down" is important as a further hint that the hymn of Valentinus itself may be related to this view of humanity as sprung from a divine root.

There may be some difficulty with the suggested relation between the "living realm" as "borne on spirit" in line 2, and the divine "fruit" here "borne from the deep" (and the "child from the womb," for that matter).

"Deep" (and "womb") would have to refer to aspects of God, or at least to the "higher" realities from which the lower proceed, rather than to the lower, intermediary, "spirit." According to the second line, the "things borne" are supported from below, but here they would seem, paradoxically at best, to be borne from above. Yet the contradiction seems innate to the inverted root metaphor itself, and is present in its use even prior to Valentinus. While fruit is borne from the depths (of the earth), in this case the root is inverted and the growth comes from above. Thus the "fruit" and "child" are extended from their divine root, but also supported by the spiritual firmament.

What then are these higher realities? Apart from the identification of the "child" as the divine Logos, we cannot go far in interpreting these without the admittedly dangerous exercise of reading back from later texts and systems. There are some reasonably close parallels to the imagery of βυθός and μήτρα in specifically Christian literature such as the (rather late) fifth *Hymn* of Synesius of Cyrene, which speaks of βυθὸς πατρῷος, probably showing the influence of the earlier *Chaldean Oracles*,[69] as well as of σοφία κοσμοτεχνίτις. There are also reasonable parallels for βυθός in the descriptions of Valentinian myths by the heresiologists, which make it equivalent to the highest God (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.1.1; 1.11.1) as well as applying the language of "fruits" to the description of emanations. Although it is true that nothing from Nag Hammadi clearly associates "the Depths" with the "Highest God", there are instances where "Depths" act in ways reminiscent of Valentinus' βυθός.[70] There are also examples of feminine personification of Wisdom much closer in time to Valentinus, such as in the Wisdom of Solomon, so the maternal figure could also be traced back into Hellenistic Jewish speculation, rather than requiring more exotic (e.g., specifically "Gnostic") origins.[71]

It is at least possible that Jesus is referred as the "fruit" of line 6 as well as the child of line 7. Jesus the perfect Man may be expected to exemplify the divine-human relationship expressed in the idea of the divine root in the *Timaeus*. The crucified Jesus is also referred to as "fruit of the Father" in the *Gospel of Truth* (18.24-5).[72] I think it more likely, however, that the two subjects of the final lines are different things or beings, just as the pair of "alls" in the opening lines and the sequence of hanging elements were separate referents rather than mere restatements.

If the child is indeed the Logos, then the "womb" seems to be some feminine aspect of God or feminine divine principle, likely to be Sophia, as much because of biblical precedent as because of Gnostic development.

Some connection with later Valentinian Sophia-myth therefore seems likely, although there is no sign of a fall.[73] The "fruit" may have the more general character of aeons, or perhaps be divine beings such as angels,[74] and the "deep" is probably, as most have concluded, the highest God.

Any explanation that seeks to relate the last two lines to divine figures runs into a problem of order: it would be more readily understandable if the feminine figure were introduced in the next-to-last line, rather than as the apparent climax of the hymn and of the ascending cosmological description of lines 3-5, since the comparable material, whether Jewish, Christian, Gnostic or philosophical, tends to place the male principle above the female. But if "depth" is the high God from whom the aeons emanate as "fruit," and that "child" is the Logos, then (whether or not the "womb" is really a separate figure or being) it is not unreasonable that the climax should be the salvific appearance of the Logos, and for that matter Valentinus' own determinative religious experience. Here the "harvest" may be invoked, as the "name" which "completes the lack" of understanding: the hymn is not merely descriptive of objective cosmic order, but constitutes a call to subjective perception and appropriation of divine realities, made possible through the Logos. The hymn does not simply proclaim how things are, but how they are to be perceived and understood or grasped, "harvested."[75]

Thus the later Valentinian evidence supports one set of possibilities for interpretation suggested by Platonist tradition, i.e., that the "fruit" aspect of the hymn and even the whole, given the title, somehow deals with a myth of emanations. Although it may be dangerous to read this back, the prominence not only of the metaphor but of a clearly mythical use thereof by the pupils should encourage us to be open to the existence of something similar in the work of the master.[76] The prominence of the "fruit" imagery in a variety of texts suggests that the idea of "harvest" or "fruit" may have been a motif in Valentinus' own teaching; otherwise, however much we try to do justice to the fragments in themselves we are left with a bigger problem in trying to explain the origin of the metaphor.

Conclusion

Although a variety of possible interpretations for the hymn cannot be ruled out, this is not to say that one is not more likely than others. Indeed, the ambiguity of the text must be taken into account in reconstructing its meaning and purpose. In one sense the poem is indeed a collection of

unremarkable statements about the nature of the universe, able to be understood as a philosophical or religious text acknowledging the nature of the universe and the implied glory of the Creator. Yet there is sufficient evidence to suggest that it may describe unseen realities, including the genesis of the Logos. The hymn therefore seems to state the essence of Valentinus' cosmological system, without providing all that is necessary to understand it.

Granted that there are differences between Valentinus and Ptolemy, it is also at the point of having acknowledged but not expanded upon the fact of a monistic cosmic origin that Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora* stops, with the promise of esoteric information to come. The *Gospel of Truth* has likewise been interpreted as an exoteric text.[77] Irenaeus suggests that the Valentinians of his acquaintance proceeded in this way.[78] The obscurity of the text, as much or more than these later examples of distinctions between inner and outer circles of membership and of meaning, suggests that like those others, the hymn is an exoteric piece, perhaps of a catechetical nature.

The hermeneutical key may be the title, the "name" which completes what is lacking in the artefact: θέρος, "harvest," is the gathering of the fruits. Read more than literally, the hymn becomes an expression of the drama of creation and salvation, both in the unfolding of the aeons and the elements, and in the discernment and appropriation of these fruits by those to whom these things are perceptible. Why this imagery? Connections with the harvest language of John 4 have been suggested before now, perhaps largely because of the comments by the later Valentinian exegete Heracleon, conveyed with respect by Origen. I suggest, on verbal grounds, that a link with Matthew 24:32-3 is more likely:

> From the fig tree learn its lesson (μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν): as soon as its branch becomes tender and puts forth its leaves, you know that summer is near (γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος). So also, when you see all these things (ὅταν ἴδητε πάντα ταῦτα), you know (γινώσκετε) that he is near, at the very gates.[79]

Only a little further New Testament inter-textuality is necessary to add the fruit of the fig to the leaves (cf. Mark 11:13), to produce the basis for a fuller allegorizing interpretation, turning the apocalyptic tone of the Gospel text into one of "realized eschatology."[80] The hymn itself then tells the lesson or parable to be learnt, one which reveals the significance both of what is seen in the visible world and of what is known otherwise. When certain things are seen, then others, above all the nearness of the Logos, can be known.

Valentinus Gnosticus?

One text, however closely examined, cannot answer the question of Valentinus' real position. Examination of the hymn certainly does not in itself give us reason to think that Valentinus held all the opinions attributed to him in heresiological accounts. There are, in fact, particular aspects of "Valentinianism" that may seem especially difficult to reconcile with the hymn. Most strikingly, there is little room for a negative or grossly defective view of the material universe, and no mention of a demiurge in what seems at least to include a description of the created order. The relatedness of all being is at least as striking as the apparent separation between the visible and intellectual or divine worlds. The terminology is often, but not always, difficult to compare directly with the heresiological accounts.

It is not likely, however, that the hymn can be understood without reference to a complex world-view involving elements such as a division between noetic and aesthetic realms and a myth of emanations, including that of the Logos. Precisely these elements are provided in the other fragments of Valentinus that we have. While the interpretation suggested here is consistent with a more speculative and mythological system than that attributed to Valentinus by Markschies, it is not necessarily much more "Gnostic," and need not make Valentinus more or less than a Middle-Platonizing exegete of some sort.[81] Yet there are enough similarities to imagine how a system that might produce this hymn could also be taken up and reused to form a more intricate one such as that of Ptolemy. If Valentinus was not a "Valentinian," both the content of the hymn *per se* and the links with his disciples suggest that he was at least a "proto-Valentinian." Parallels with Nag Hammadi material also suggest that we cannot discount Gnostic influences on Valentinus, granted that they are not necessary to make sense of the hymn,[82] but this text contributes little in itself to the question of whether Valentinus took over elements of an existing system (perhaps rather more tentatively than his successors?), or was himself developed and allegorized by those who came after.

If the Valentinus of the hymn is more "Gnostic" than, say, Philo or other Middle-Platonists, it would seem largely to be in terms of the esotericism suggested by the initial opacity of the hymn. The very difficulty of interpretation, surely almost as real in the ancient world as in our demonstrably limited ability to exegete it now, may provide some initial indication of how a fairly mild dualism might have been developed into more complex and more radically dualistic formulations by the successors

of Valentinus. The difficulty of gathering this harvest might well reflect the social organization of the emerging movement, and warrants comparison with reports of apparent (and very biblical!) distinctions between advanced and elementary forms of belief among Gnostic Christians. These, as much as doctrinal or philosophical tendencies, seem to lead inexorably to what we may call "Gnosticism."

Notes

* My thanks go to Harold W. Attridge for comments on an earlier version of this paper, and to the editors-in-chief of *Vigiliae Christianae* for helpful criticisms.

[1] *Valentinus Gnosticus? Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentins* (WUNT 2/65; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992).

[2] Note the influential study → Gilles Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," *Vigiliae Christianae* 1 (1947) 43-73, and now the same author's further commemorative and wider-ranging reflectic → "The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic," *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996) 327-352. I am grateful to Professor Quispel and the editors for the early opportunity to read the latter.

[3] Notably the work of Bentley Layton, represented in his re-arrangement of the fragments of Valentinus according to their supposed place in the Gnostic myth, in *The Gnostic Scriptures* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1987); and that of Ann McGuire, "Valentinus and the *Gnostike Haeresis*: An Investigation of Valentinus's position in the History of Gnosticism," (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University 1983).

[4] As was also suggested by Harnack, among others. More recently the work of G.C. Stead ("In Search of Valentinus," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* [ed. B. Layton; 2 vols.; Studies in the History of Religions 40-1; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980] 75-102) also recognizes the differences between the fragments and the Valentinian systems, and gives the fragments priority.

[5] On Markschies's response to this question see his essays, "Die Krise einer philosophischen Bibeltheologie in der Alten Kirche oder: Valentin und die valentinianische Gnosis zwischen philosophischer Bibelinterpretation und mythologischer Häresie," and "Alte und neue Texte und Forschungen zu Valentin und den Anfängen der 'valentinianischen' Gnosis—Von J.E. Grabe und F.C. Baur bis B. Aland," both in Alexander Böhlig and Christoph Markschies, *Gnosis und Manichäismus: Forschungen und Studien zu Texten von Valentin und Mani sowie zu den Biblioteken von Nag Hammadi und Medinet Madi* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der alteren Kirche 72; New York and Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994) 1-37 and 39-111 respectively. On this text see especially "Die Krise einer philosophischen Bibeltheologie," 15-19 and "Alte und neue Texte und Forschungen zu Valentin," 95-6.

[6] See especially the discussion by Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 218-259. The poem has also been substantially treated by Bernhard Herzhoff, "Zwei gnostische Psalmen: Interpretation und Untersuchung von Hippolytus, Refutatio V 10,2 und VI 37,7," (Ph.D. diss., Bonn, 1973) 24-77; by Thieko Wolbergs, *Griechische religiöse Gedichte der ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 40; Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1971) 1.23-36 and, since the work of Markschies, also by Jens

Holzhausen, "Ein gnostischer Psalm? Zu Valentins Psalm in Hippol. Ref. VI 37,7," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 36 (1993) 67-80. Alois Kehl, "Beiträge zum Verständnis einiger gnostischer und frühchristlicher Psalmen und Hymnen," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 15 (1972) 92-119, presents a somewhat strained numerical-mystical analysis of the hymn. Other, shorter, discussions will be referred to below. I am unaware of any previous article-length study in English.

[7] *Ref.* 6.37.7; Text from the edition of Miroslav Marcovich, *Hippolytus: Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (New York and Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986) 253.

[8] See the translation and discussion by Bentley Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures* 246-249.

[9] Apart from the correction of the MS reading ἐξειχουμένην in line 4 (probably a scribal error, since the following discussion in Hippolytus seems to assume the corrected reading or another; see Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 219) and the problem of elision of δέ (not elided in lines 4 and 5, although it precedes vowels; the MS writes it fully in both those places), the chief "error" is the use of stress rather than quantity to achieve a "long" in the first line (κρεμάμενα). This is typical of changes in Greek Poetry at the time: see M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982) 162-4; U. von Wilamovitz-Moellendorf, "Lesefrüchte 29," *Hermes* 34 (1899) 218-9.

[10] Another "Gnostic" verse-text for instance, the *Hymn of the Naasenes to Attis* (Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.9.8-9) has been described as rather closer to "traditional citharody" (West, *Greek Metre* 176). See further U. von Wilamovitz-Moellendorf, "Lesefrüchte 90," *Hermes* 37 (1902) 328-31.

[11] See T.F. Higham, "Teliambi: a Review of 'Mouse-tailed,' alias 'Miuric,' Hexameter verse," *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays presented to Gilbert Murray* (ed. C. Bailey *et al.*; Oxford: Clarendon, 1936) 300 and 312, citing the opinions of J.U. Powell, K.F.W. Schmidt and P. Maas.

[12] The two papyri may perhaps represent the same work, although they are two centuries apart on paleographic grounds. *P. Oxy.* 1795 is also translated into English verse in Higham, "Teliambi," 323-324.

[13] The authenticity of the work is disputed.

[14] *P. Amh.* 1.23-28. The song has an anapaestic meter. Although it is an acrostic and could thus be compared to the Ps 119, so too are the Oxyrhynchus songs discussed above. A range of dates for this hymn is provided by Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 222 n. 34.

[15] In *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (ed. W. Morel; Stuttgart: Teubner, 1963) 138-9. Higham suggests that these emerge from a popular genre, *calabri versus*, rather than directly imitating Greek forms: "Teliambi," 319. One step removed also are Latin mouse-tailed hexameters attributed to Livius Andronicus by Terentianus Maurus, *De Metris* 1922-39: see "Teliambi," 299-303, 310-311, 318-320.

[16] West, *Greek Metre* 162-4.

[17] Higham, "Teliambi," 319.

[18] Holzhausen ("Ein gnostischer Psalm?" 67) takes the title to mean this is a "harvest-song."

[19] Higham, "Teliambi," 300.

[20] Also in support of singing, but less convincing, is the suggestion of A.J. Festugière, "Notes sur les extraits de Théodote de Clément d'Alexandrie et sur les fragments de Valentin," *Vigiliae Christianae* 3 (1949) 193-207, that "θέρος" is an indication of tune.

[21] Markschies discusses Hippolytus' use of "psalm" as significant in terms of biblical

parallels (*Valentinus Gnosticus?* 225), but the label may reflect later Valentinians' usage.

[22] The *Letter of Ptolemy to Flora* and Irenaeus' reports (*Adv. Haer.* 3.15.2) both suggest that even later Valentinians were at least similar in ritual and public discourse to the orthodox; *a fortiori* we should conclude that Valentinus himself and his associates were not a wholly distinct group, let alone a "sect" in the modern sense.

[23] The use of classical poetic forms in Christian liturgy was controversial long after this point; see (with specific reference to the West but some general relevance here too) W. Evenepoel, "The Place of Poetry in Latin Christianity," *Early Christian Poetry: A Collection of Essays* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 22; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993) 51-7.

[24] Simone Pétrement's discussion (*A Separate God: The Christian Origins of Gnosticism* [San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1990] 373-76) of the possibility that Valentinus was the author of the Odes makes no mention of θέρος. The question of the origin (including language) of the *Odes* is discussed in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985) 2.725-734. See also Michael Lattke, *Die Oden Salomons in ihrer Bedeutung für neues Testament und Gnosis* (Freiburg [Switz.]: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979-86), and M. Franzmann's "A Study of the Odes of Solomon with Reference to the French Scholarship 1909-1980," in Lattke, *Die Oden Salomons* 3.371-425, especially 407-14.

[25] See Holzhausen, "Ein gnostischer Psalm?" especially 78-80.

[26] Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 259.

[27] Title rather than tune, despite Festugière, "Notes sur les extraits de Théodote de Clément d'Alexandrie et sur les fragments de Valentin," 206-7.

[28] Clement, *Strom.* 4.89.6-4.90.1. The fragments are numbered here according to the system of Völker, used also by Markschies.

[29] Clement, *Strom.* 2.36.2-4.

[30] David Dawson (*Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Alexandria* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992] 127-82, especially 135-45) argues that Valentinus re-interprets both Platonic and Jewish creation accounts to provide humanity with the "name," rather than the "image," of God, on the basis that images were secondary and inferior. This emphasis on names is important, and to suggest that the "name" is a Christological title is itself not impossible, but gives more authority to the *Gospel of Truth* as a key to Valentinus' own thinking than I can accept.

[31] *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 241-2.

[32] This is not impossible, but of the parallels, that from *Corpus Hermeticum* 3,2 (καὶ ἀνακρεμασθέντων πνεύματι ὀχεῖσθαι) seems to me ambiguous at best for Markschies's purposes, and may in fact support the position argued here; it does not seem to speak of two spirits. Philo (*Plant.* 3, *Aet.* 115) also indicates that ὀχεῖσθαι is associated with cosmological description, since both passages are dealing with the arrangements of elements; yet neither refers to "spirit," but simply to an element being borne upon a lower one.

[33] Although the use of δέ is hardly conclusive, it also supports an approach which differentiates the two lines.

[34] An epistemological distinction is also noted by Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures* 246.

[35] If Valentinus may be characterized as "Platonizing," the use of ὄχημα in the myth of the *Phaedrus* (246d-247c) for the chariots of the Gods would be a clear precedent for the use of the word in describing the placement of divine beings in particular. Valentinian texts are among later witnesses to such use; see Quispel's discussion of the *Letter to*

Rheginus, "The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic," 17-22. For the "κρεμάμενα" see further below on *Timaeus* 90.

[36] Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.42.2.

[37] Clement, *Strom.* 2.114.3-6.

[38] Clement, *Strom.* 2.36.2-4 and 4.89.6-4.90.1. This distinction goes back to *Timaeus*, 37c-d.

[39] For instances of the importance of knowledge in Valentinian writings etc., see *Gospel of Truth* 29; *Strom.* 2.114.3-6 (*fr.* 2); Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* 1.4.1; *Gospel of Philip* 83. Versions of the Sophia myth in Didymus (?) (*De Trinitate* 3.42) and Irenaeus' account (1.2.2) also suggest a distinction between sight and knowledge; see Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic," 11-14.

[40] Philo, *Leg.* 2.49 etc.

[41] E.g., Holzhausen, "Ein gnostischer Psalm?" 67, cf. 68-71.

[42] Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 238-9. I note also Quispel's suggestive paraphrase: "I see in the Spirit that every thing is coherent with every other thing, I intuit in the spirit that all things are contained by the Spirit" ("The Original Doctrine of Valentinus the Gnostic," 24).

[43] Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.42.2. This basis for Valentinus' system and authority is also discussed by Elaine Pagels, "Visions, Appearances and Apostolic Authority: Gnostic and Orthodox Traditions," *Gnosis: Festschrift für Hans Jonas* (ed. B. Aland; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 415-30.

[44] Compare 1 Cor. 14:2, 16; Rev. 1:10, 4:2. I note Markschies' resistance to the authenticity of the vision and the possibility of a mystical aspect to Valentinus' theology generally, but remain unconvinced that these refusals are justified, or indeed necessary for a less "Gnostic" approach to Valentinus.

[45] The epistemology of Synesius of Cyrene (in whose hymns some similarity to Valentinus' use of "Depth" and "womb" emerges—see below) is of interest; C. Lacombarde comments on the importance of ". . . la faculté représentative, φαντασία, dont 'l'âme pneumatique,' intermédiare entre l'organisme physique et l'élément spirituel, est le support, ὄχημα . . .": *Synésios de Cyrène: Hymnes* (ed. C. Lacombrade; Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1978) 1.xxxiv.

[46] ". . . καὶ ὁ ἀὴρ ἐλαθρὸς ὢν ἠκολούθησε τῷ πνεύματι . . ." Markschies cites the Middle Platonist Atticus in his discussion of the Homeric "Golden Chain" motif (see further below): ὁ Πλάτων εἰς θεὸν καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ πάντ' ἀνάπτει (*fr.* 3, in *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 237), which makes an interesting parallel in its use of one divinity as cosmological source and goal.

[47] The Stoic doctrine of spirit as both superior and permeating seems relevant; cf. Chrysippus, *SVF* 473, 479, 1027. See further H. Kleinknecht, "πνεῦμα," *TDNT* 6.332-359.

[48] Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 219-20.

[49] E.g. *Poimandres* 1.4-5; For other parallels, see Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 239-40.

[50] This is more important for Holzhausen ("Ein gnostischer Psalm?" 71-2), who sees the anthropological aspects as quite separate, and their inclusion as a literary device.

[51] Ἐξέχω is used for the shining of the sun, or even more closely, "depending from" something or someone.

[52] The illustrations Markschies gives from Eustathius of Thessalonica (*Comm. on Iliad*

8.10-19), Proclus (*Comm. on Timaeus* 1.28c) and Synesius (*Hymns* 2.190-3) seem to deal specifically with the elemental world as "hanging," in keeping with the interpretation of lines 1 & 2 already argued here; that from Aristides (*Speeches* 43.15) also has the Gods "hanging," but such a picture of multiple divine intermediaries would be awkward for Markschies's exegesis and could be argued as a link with Ptolemy; see *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 233-237.

[53] *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 239-40.

[54] See also Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentinus," 24.

[55] *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 246-55.

[56] Layton's translation of the last two participles by "rushing" (*The Gnostic Scriptures* 248) is possible, but not adequate to what has been argued here about the relation between the last two lines and line 2.

[57] Plotinus uses φέρω for the idea that the aeons "bear" the image of the original principle, the "root": *Enneads* 3.3.7.

[58] Alastair Logan's comment (review of Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* in *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 45 [1994] 312) is that "Markschies' Valentinus is not sufficiently biblical or Platonic!"

[59] *Ref.* 6.42.2.

[60] Robert M. Grant ("Notes on Gnosis," *Vigiliae Christianae* 11 [1957] 145-51) makes the link between the passages, but argues that the hymn is incomplete and would have gone on to narrate the vision.

[61] Jo Ann Cavallo, "Agricultural Imagery in the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Truth," *Religion and Literature* 24 (1992) 27-38.

[62] Trans R.G. Bury (Loeb Classical Library).

[63] The development of a tradition of reflection on this passage and on humanity's upright stance is traced by Antonie Wlosok, *Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Terminologie der gnostischen Erlösungsvorstellung* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1960) 8-47. The divine root idea occurs, for instance, in Plotinus, *Enneads* 3.3.7.

[64] *Adv. Haer.* 1.2.4; 1.2.6; 1.4.4; 1.4.5 etc. Markschies's reduction of the metaphor to "eine rhetorische Stilfigur des Irenaeus" (*Valentinus Gnosticus?* 255) is therefore unwarranted.

[65] Cf. Apuleius, *Metam.* 1.15; Petronius, 39.12, both of whom use the pumpkin metaphor as a term of abuse. It is noteworthy also that Seneca's quip on the apotheosis of Claudius (his "pumpkinification" [Dio Cassius 60.35], which is usually turned into the title of his satire on the same subject) combines the "pumpkin = idiot" aspect with inappropriate attribution of divinity.

[66] In the *Letter to Flora*, "bearing fruit" would be compatible with the metaphorical (rather than mythological) use of the imagery in the canonical Gospels, but Ptolemy indicates that Flora has to be initiated into the deeper mysteries of the "apostolic tradition," including the generation of various natures from the first principle (33.7.8-9). The references to "harvest" from Heracleon, cited in Origen (*Fragments* 32-36 in *In Joh.* 13.41-50), seem rather unremarkable in discussion of John 4:35-38.

[67] Cavallo, "Agricultural Imagery in the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Truth," 27-38. The *Gospel of Truth* is declared specifically compatible with the hymn by F.B. Standaert, not in terms of content so much as the ability of the author "manifester à nouveau cette unité si caractéristique entre la vision particulière du réel et son mode

d'expression littéraire" ("L'évangile de vérité: critique et lecture," *New Testament Studies* 22 [1975] 264). This does not mean that Valentinus was the author.

[68] *Tripartite Tractate* 51.17; also 69.18; 37; 74.13 and 20; 75.34; 78.26; 86.25 and 33; 87.31; 93.3. See the notes by Harold W. Attridge and Elaine Pagels in *Nag Hammadi Codex I: The Jung Codex* (ed. Harold W. Attridge; 2 vols.; Nag Hammadi Studies 22 & 23; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985) 2.217-8, and comments by Einar Thomassen in *Le Traité Tripartite* (Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, Section "Textes" 19; Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1989) 284-5, who also sees a link with the hymn of Valentinus.

[69] Cf. *fr.* 18 in *Oracles Chaldaïques avec un choix de commentaires anciens* (ed. É. des Places SJ; Paris: Belles Lettres, 1971): "οἳ τὸν ὑπέρκοσμον πατρικὸν βυθὸν ἴστε νοοῦντες," and see further the comments by Des Places (9 and 38) on Synesius and the *Oracles*, which may be not much more recent than the hymn of Valentinus.

[70] In the *Apocalypse of Adam* (78.23) the "Son of Man" is engendered in the abyss; in the *Hypostasis of the Archons* (87.4-7) the abyss is the mother of Ialdabaoth, the demiurge. Both these instances link the depths with the production of a child. A similar association is found in Irenaeus' report of "others" for whom an offspring appears in the "power of the deep" which is "parent of the entirety" (*Adv. Haer.* 1.30.1). These "depth-child" motifs work slightly differently to the last two lines of Valentinus' hymn, yet the possibility of a connection ought not to be ruled out. N.b., "ἄβυσσος kann zu Bythos synonym verwendet werden . . ." (Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 246 n. 181).

[71] E.g., Philo, *Det.* 54, where Sophia receives the honor due a mother in creation and God that of a father; the *Wisdom of Solomon* is generally regarded as coming from Hellenistic Jewish circles in Egypt; see U. Wilckens, "Σοφία," *TDNT* 7.498-499. Markschies points out (*Valentinus Gnosticus?* 252-3) that there are no references to the highest God using the Coptic equivalent of βυθός in the Nag Hammadi materials, and the one apparent parallel to the use of "womb" is in one (and only one) of the versions of the *Apocryphon of John* (NHC II.1, 5.5). This is, nevertheless, a more specific parallel, and is applied to the figure of "Ennoia" who is a second person near the Father. "Ennoia" is made consort of "Depth" in the description of Ptolemy's system by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 1.12.1).

[72] Plutarch (among others) uses κρέμαμαι for crucifixion (*Life of Caesar* 2). This raises the possibility of a parallelism in the hymn of visible historical events and invisible metaphysical ones all centering on Jesus, but this relies upon the *Gospel of Truth* as an interpretative key.

[73] I also note Alastair Logan's interesting suggestion (review of Markschies, 313) that "Since Bythos of line 6 is evidently the supreme being, Womb must surely be the figure of the Holy Spirit of Gen. 1:2 hovering below him, permeating and responsible for everything beneath, i.e., the elements of soul and flesh." Yet it seems to me that the "womb" aspect is more likely to belong above "spirit" and to engender other spiritual realities, rather than to be "spirit" and linked directly to "soul" and "flesh," which according to the hymn are linked with air and ether before spirit.

[74] Note the prominence of angels in *fr.* 1, and the reference in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (NHC IV) to angels as the fruit of the aeons (73.29 f.).

[75] Holzhausen ("Ein gnostische Psalm?" 78-9) concludes similarly, but sees the content of the harvest somewhat differently.

[76] Basilides also used the idea of a primeval root containing all reality (Hippolytus,

Ref. 7.21.3). *Trimorphic Protennoia* uses fruit language for the emanation of the aeons (41.30; 44.19 f.). So also does the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (NHC IV) with specific reference to the "great incorruptible race" and angels as the fruit of the aeons (73.29 f.), and to emanation from Plesithea (NHC III 56.9). *Zostrianos* also uses fruit as part of the description of aeons (48.16). This use for the description of emanations accounts for much of the "fruit" language in the Nag Hammadi Library. Some exceptions: *Apocryphon of John* (21.21 f.), where the fruit of the rulers is spoken of in terms of the Eden story; *Apocryphon of James*, where fruit is like seed in a parable of the Kingdom (7.24-32 and 12.26).

[77] Harold W. Attridge, "The Gospel of Truth as an Exoteric Text," *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (ed. Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986) 239-55.

[78] *Adv. Haer.* 1 Prol. 1.1-2.

[79] Trans. New Revised Standard Version.

[80] Markschies's interpretation of "harvest" is also eschatological (*Valentinus Gnosticus?* 255-8), referring to a *magnus annus*.

[81] See further Stead, "In Search of Valentinus," 75-102, and especially Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* 388-407.

[82] Despite a different interpretation in this case, I therefore concur with Markschies's conclusion to the wider question of Valentinus' Gnosticism: "Eine wirklich sichere Antwort gibt es leider nicht" (*Valentinus Gnosticus?* 407).

The University of Notre Dame Australia
19 Mouat Street, *Fremantle*, Western Australia 6160

NOCHMALS: VALENTINUS UND DIE GNOSTIKOI

BEOBACHTUNGEN ZU IRENAEUS, HAER. I 30,15 UND TERTULLIAN, VAL. 4,2

VON

CHRISTOPH MARKSCHIES

Gilles Quispel hat jüngst[1] Beobachtungen zu zwei häresiologischen Passagen aus dem Werk des Irenaeus und des Tertullian vorgetragen, die den römischen Theologen Valentin betreffen—und obwohl seine und meine Deutung dieser Figur beliebig weit voneinander entfernt und nur sehr schlecht vermittelbar sind, versuche ich, mit folgendem Beitrag das Gespräch wenigstens an einem Detailpunkt aufzunehmen. Dagegen kann die sehr viel grundlegendere Frage, welchen historischen Wert derartige häresiologische Konstruktionen von Autoren der alten Kirche für die Rekonstruktion von tatsächlichen Schulzusammenhängen, aber auch von authentischen Lehrgebäuden haben, an dieser Stelle nicht verhandelt werden—hier zeigen sich ebenfalls deutliche Unterschiede zwischen unseren beiden Sichtweisen: Während Quispel (und dies selbstverständlich mit vollkommenem Recht) darauf aufmerksam macht, daß Häresiologen wie Irenaeus und Tertullian nicht einfach "Lügner" waren,[2] bin ich allerdings nach wie vor der Meinung, daß der Ansatzpunkt für die Lösung der Frage, wie sich Valentinus zu der γνωστικὴ αἵρεσις verhielt, nicht zuerst die Referate der altkirchlichen Häresiologen oder bestimmte Details aus ihnen, sondern Valentins Fragmente sind.[3] Die späteren Außenperspektiven auf die Entwicklung stellen natürlich nicht eine bewußte Lüge oder böswillige Verzeichnung dar, sondern eine interessengeleitete Sicht, die mindestens Akzente und Gewichte verschiebt—aber solche Differenzierungen sind ja eigentlich, wie jetzt wieder Hans-Martin Schenke betont hat,[4] bei der Erforschung des Neuen Testamentes oder anderer antiker Texte längst eine Selbstverständlichkeit geworden. Allerdings will ich Quispel herzlich gern einräumen, daß ich es bisher versäumt habe, sämtliche entsprechenden Stellen einer eingehenden Untersuchung zu unterziehen und neben einer gründlichen Analyse der häresiologischen Konzeptionen meine eigene Rekonstruktion der Geschichte der valentinianischen Schule vorzulegen. Entsprechend vorsichtig waren und sind auch alle Beobachtungen zu den Fragmenten formuliert: "Natürlich

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 179-187

bleibt aufgrund der nun schon mehrfach angedeuteten Unsicherheiten ... diese Rekonstruktion ein Versuch, dessen Historizität kaum zuverlässig nachgewiesen werden kann."[5] Für die häresiologischen Konzeptionen besitzen wir jetzt freilich die gründlichen Monographien von Alain Le Boulluec[6] und Jaap Mansfeld;[7] zur Frage, wie sie sich zur historischen Wirklichkeit der Schulentwicklung verhalten, habe ich mich auf dem letztjährigen Festkolloquium zum fünfzigjährigen Jubiläum der Nag-Hammadi-Texte in Haverford/Philadelphia nun erstmals ausführlicher, wenn auch kaum abschließend geäußert.[8] Freilich ist hier noch viel zu tun—und auf dieses Desiderat meiner eigenen Untersuchungen zum Problemfeld "Valentinus und die Gnostikoi" hat Quispel mit seinem jüngsten Beitrag zu Recht den Finger gelegt. Hier folgen nun lediglich zwei Marginalien zu diesem großen Komplex:

Mit seinen eigenen Beobachtungen zu Irenaeus und Tertullian wollte Quispel zeigen, daß der nordafrikanische Theologe, dem wir wichtige Informationen zum *Unterschied* zwischen Valentin und seinen Schülern verdanken,[9] ein Zeuge dafür sei, daß Valentin "the doctrine of the Gnostikoi" übernommen habe—also dem wohlbekannten häresiologischen Schema des Irenaeus folgt, wonach Valentin "als erster aus der sogenannten gnostischen αἵρεσις deren Prinzipien (oder: Anfänge) in die seiner Schule (διδασκαλεῖον) eigene Gestalt" umgeformt habe.[10] Nehmen wir aber beide Autoren nacheinander noch einmal vor:

I Zu Irenaeus, haer. I 30,15

In den geschilderten häresiologischen Rahmen gehört die erste von Quispel herangezogene und in Anlehnung an Sven Lundström übersetzte Stelle, haer. I 30,15. Nach längeren Bemerkungen über Barbelioten, Ophiten und Sethianer erklärt der Bischof von Lyon nach dem Zeugnis der Handschriften: *Tales quidem secundum eos sententiae sunt, a quibus, uelut Lernaea Hydra, multiplex capitibus fera de Ualentini scola generata est*;[11] zu deutsch und möglichst wörtlich: "So (ungereimt) sind die Meinungen derjenigen, von denen, wie die lernäische Hydra, ein Ungeheuer mit vielen Köpfen aus der Schule des Valentin entstanden ist" (*a quibus* bezieht sich dabei auf *eos*, nicht auf *sententiae*).[12]

Vergleichsweise einfach an dieser schwierigen Stelle zu verstehen sind noch die Einzelelemente, aus denen der Satz zusammengebaut ist: Der Ausdruck "Schule des Valentin" ist aus der Lektüre voraufgehender Passagen des Buches bereits bekannt. Irenaeus differenziert, wie ich an anderer Stelle

ausführlich zu zeigen versucht habe,[13] genau zwischen der "Schule Valentins" und der "Schule des Ptolemaeus". Der Bischof von Lyon geriet mit Menschen in Kontakt, die erklärten, sie seien Schüler Valentins[14]—aber in Wahrheit οἱ περὶ Πτολεμαῖον,[15] Leute aus der Umgebung des römischen Theologen Ptolemaeus waren. Eine solche "Schule des Ptolemaeus" kennt ja übrigens auch Tertullian.[16] Den Ausdruck "Schule Valentins" reservierte Irenaeus also offenbar für Personen, die er (zu Recht oder zu Unrecht, das sei jetzt einmal dahingestellt) zum unmittelbaren Schülerkreis Valentins rechnete; "Umfeld des Ptolemaeus" wendete er dagegen eher auf die Schüler dieser Schüler, also auf die an, die er sozusagen für "Enkelschüler" Valentins hielt. Der nur an unserer Stelle vorliegende Vergleich der Häretiker mit jener im lernäischen Sumpf lebenden vielköpfigen Meerschlange Hydra stellt schließlich eine etwas gehässigere Variante jener Pflanzenmetaphorik dar, die der Bischof mehrfach an anderer Stelle verwendet.[17]

Aber wie ist das Bild nun genau gemeint? Was entsteht genau aus was? Die französischen Editoren haben das auf den ersten Blick störende *de* emendiert, eine hypothetische griechische Retroversion vorgelegt (Τοιαῦται μὲν οὖν αἱ κατ' αὐτοὺς γνῶμαι, ἀφ' ὧν, καθάπερ ἡ Λερναία ὕδρα, τὸ πολυκέφαλον θηρίον ἡ Οὐαλεντίνου σχολὴ ἐγεννήθη[18]), und aufgrund dieses Textes hat Norbert Brox jüngst in seiner deutschen Ausgabe auch übersetzt: "So sieht also das aus, was diese Leute an Meinungen vertreten. Daraus ist, wie die lernäische Hydra, ein Ungeheuer mit vielen Köpfen entstanden, die Schule des Valentin."[19] Metaphorisch gesprochen erhob sich also dieser Interpretation nach aus dem lernäischen Sumpf, d.i. den vorher referierten gnostischen Theorien, die Hydra der valentinianischen Schule. Während der Text der französischen Editoren einen Sinn genau auf der Linie von haer. I 11,1 vorstellt, ist der Sinn des handschriftlichen Bestandes, an dem Lundström[20] und Quispel festhalten wollen, nicht so leicht zu verstehen: Beide interpretieren den Text so, als ob gleichsam von *zwei* Agenten die Rede sei: Den mit *a quibus* bezeichneten "gnostischen Vorgängern" und dem durch *de* angezeigten Agenten—und das ist ja wohl grammatikalisch dann auch kaum anders möglich. Lundström setzte seine Deutung aber bemerkenswerterweise nicht so fort, wie es naheliegt—und zunächst ist einmal diese m.E. naheliegende Interpretation vorzuführen: Die Hydra des Irenaeus ist sowohl *a quibus*, von den gnostischen Vorgängern Valentins,[21] als auch *de Ualentini scola*, aus der Schule Valentins, entstanden. Dann wäre relativ klar, daß die Hydra nicht die Schule Valentins sein kann, sondern etwas anderes sein muß. Es böte sich natürlich an, hier wieder eine bereits angespielte Passage aus dem Prolog des Werkes einzulesen: Dort werden,

wie oben angedeutet (Anm. 14 bzw. 15) οἱ περὶ Πτολεμαῖον als ἀπάνθισμα ... τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς vorgestellt. Wenn man also Lundströms Vorbehalten gegen die Konjekturalkritik des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts folgen will und in jedem Falle am überlieferten Textbestand festhalten will, dann scheint mir die erste und naheliegendste Deutung: Die Hydra, um die es Irenaeus hier zu tun ist, wuchs *a quibus*—"von den gnostischen Vorgängern Valentins her" *de Ualentini scola*, aus der Schule Valentins heraus—und es handelt sich bei der Hydra um die Schüler des Ptolemaeus, die von der Valentin-Schule hier wie im Prolog nochmals unterschieden wird. Das mag auf den ersten Blick reichlich kompliziert klingen, ist aber chronologisch gut verständlich: Irenaeus hat es zur Zeit der Abfassung seines Werkes, also in den achtziger Jahren,[22] nur noch mit (persönlichen?) Ptolemaeus-Schülern zu tun und differenziert diese aber von den persönlichen Valentin-Schülern und jener Gruppe, der Valentin selbst—jedenfalls nach der Ansicht des Irenaeus—seine Anregungen verdankte. So weit, so gut. Lundström möchte aber an der Identifikation von Hydra und Valentin-Schule festhalten—die eigentlich erst durch die Emendation des *de* von den französischen Herausgebern aufgebracht worden ist und sich vorher, wenn ich recht sehe, auch nicht in den Übersetzungen findet.[23] Dabei ist seine philologische Argumentation zur Stelle von dieser Identifikation zunächst vollkommen unabhängig: Der schwedische Philologe erinnert zunächst an eine andere Irenaeus-Passage; nach haer. I 14,1 ist Markus "Schoß und Gefäß" (μήτραν καὶ ἐκδοχεῖον/*uluam et exceptorium*[24]) eines Details der Lehre des Kolarbasus und hat "den Samen, der in ihn gelegt war, ... zur Welt gebracht" (lateinisch: *enixus est*, nicht *generata est*!). Auch hier ist der Vorgang einer Hervorbringung also mit zwei Agenten verbunden: Samen *und* Gebärmutter. Sven Lundström versucht nun an einer Reihe von Parallelen zu zeigen, daß die lateinische Konstruktion *a quibus ... de ... generata est* bzw. präziser "aktivisches *genero* eine männliche Person als Subjekt haben können muß, und dabei muss auch die Mutter bzw. Gebärmutter in einer Junktur mit *de* (oder *ex*) stehen können."[25] Das führt ihn zu folgender Paraphrase unserer nämlichen Irenaeus-Passage: "Von den gnostischen Vorgängern des Valentinus wurde also ein Ungeheuer (nämlich die Sekte, die aus Ptolemaeus und anderen Schülern des Valentinus bestand) aus der Gebärmutter (dem Unterricht des Valentinus) hervorgebracht."[26] Das ist gewiß scharfsinnig, aber an zwei Punkten etwas über das Ziel hinausgeschossen: "Unterricht Valentins" steht nicht da, die erste Klammerbemerkung ist lediglich diskutable Interpretation. Festzuhalten an Lundström bleibt, daß seine Parallelen erklären oder besser illustrieren, wie etwas gleichzeitig *a quibus* und *de qua*

hervorgebracht werden kann. Kann, aber eben nicht muß. Davon, daß Valentin "in seiner Gebärmutter die Samen der Gnostikoi hervorgebracht und an seine Schüler übermittelt hat," steht nichts im Text—auch wenn Quispel dies mit Hilfe Lundströms aus Irenaeus herauslesen will.[27] Man müßte dazu u.a. erst einmal nachweisen, daß grundsätzlich alle Belege des Wortes sich auf den sexuellen Vorgang beziehen und also des männlichen Samens und der weiblichen Gebärmutter bedürfen. Diese Behauptung kann ja aber schon aus dem unentbehrlichen lateinischen Irenaeus-Index von Bruno Reynders falsifiziert werden, der dankenswerterweise angegeben hat, was für eine Fülle von griechischen Verba die lateinische Übersetzung des vierten Jahrhunderts mit *genero* wiedergegeben hat: γεννάω, ἀποκυέω, τίκτω, γίγνομαι, γενεσιουργέω, δημιουργέω, ἀποτίκτω, ἀπογεννάω sowie παιδοποιέω.[28] Es besteht also keine Notwendigkeit, in unsere Irenaeus-Passage "Valentin und seine Gebärmutter" einzutragen.

II Zu Tertullian, Val. 4,2

Nun baut Quispel auf dieser Irenaeus-Interpretation auch noch die Deutung einer sprachlich und sachlich fast noch problematischeren Tertullian-Stelle auf—und diese müssen wir nun ebenfalls noch in den Blick nehmen, obwohl ich mich zu dieser Passage schon einmal geäußert hatte.[29] Tertullian bemerkt über Valentin in seiner Schrift gegen die Valentinianer (nach der Textform von Emil Kroymann): *Ad expugnandam conuersus ueritatem et cuiusdam ueteris opinionis semen nactus, colubro suo uiam delineauit*; "er wendete sich der Bekämpfung der Wahrheit zu und zeichnete, weil er den Samen gewisser alter Meinungen vorfand, seiner Schlange den Weg vor." Quispels Hinweis,[30] daß *coluber* hier mit der Hydra bei Irenaeus verglichen werden sollte, führt wirklich weiter und könnte sogar historisch genommen werden: Tertullian übernahm möglicherweise diese Metaphorik direkt von Irenaeus. Freilich bedarf es dazu noch einer näheren Untersuchung jenes Metaphernfeldes bei beiden Autoren, die wir an dieser Stelle nicht durchführen können. Unter den Belegen des Wortes *coluber* bei Tertullian findet sich allerdings keine wirklich vergleichbare Passage. Mir kommt es aber auf einen anderen Punkt an, nämlich die Interpretation des Ausdrucks *quaedam uetus opinio*. Quispel schreibt: "The comparison with Irenaeus makes it crystal clear that the *quaedam uetus opinio* can be nothing else than the doctrine of the Gnostikoi."[31] Auch hier differieren wir. Ich hatte seinerzeit mit Jean-Claude Fredouille den Ausdruck Tertullians auf den Platonismus bezogen, als dessen Anhänger Tertullian Valentin an zwei Stellen explizit vorstellt: *Platonicus*

fuerat bzw. *Ualentinus Platonicae sectator.*[32] Quispel weist jetzt mit vollkommenem Recht darauf hin, daß Fredouille selbst in seinem Kommentar die Verbindung zwischen der "doctrine de Valentin" und dem Johannesapokryphon erwähnt hat, wie sie ja nicht zuletzt in Quispels eigenen Arbeiten vorgestellt wird. Allerdings stellt sich an dieser Stelle doch die Frage, ob jene neuzeitliche Forschungsposition, über deren Angemessenheit diskutiert wird, auch schon die Ansicht Tertullians gewesen ist. Fredouille meint das natürlich nicht, Quispel setzt es voraus; leider hat er ebenso wie ich seinerzeit den Vergleich mit anderen Belegen des Ausdrucks bei Tertullian unterlassen. Sonst wäre nämlich aufgefallen, daß die ganze Valentinianerschrift selbst keine ähnliche explizite Anspielung enthält und in ihr auch die sonst übliche explizite Ableitung des Valentinianismus aus dem Platonismus scheinbar vollkommen fehlt—das mag an der bissigen Polemik liegen, mit der Tertullian das System durchspricht und seinen Spott über die Details ausgießt. Dem nordafrikanischen Theologen ging es in dieser Schrift eher darum, Absurdität zu demonstrieren als die Gegner mit der Philosophie zu verbinden. Das wäre offenbar zu viel der Ehre gewesen. Ich möchte im folgenden mein Versäumnis ein klein wenig beheben und einige Stellen auf die Frage prüfen, ob es im Ernst vorstellbar ist, daß Tertullian im ersten Jahrzehnt des dritten Jahrhunderts gnostische Lehren in der Art des Johannesapokryphons als "alte Meinungen" bezeichnet—er hätte damit einem gewitzten Gegner ja förmlich den Altersbeweis der gnostischen Lehre ermöglicht, wenn er zugleich an anderer Stelle beispielsweise das Neue Testament als "unser noch junges Hilfsmittel" vom Alten abhebt.[33] Das relative Alter Platons (mindestens im Vergleich zu Valentin und Ptolemaeus) konnte er ja dagegen schlecht leugnen. Eine Durchsicht entsprechender Belege bei Tertullian zeigt nun auch schon, wie stark das Wortfeld *opinio* mit der instabilen Lehrbildung der Philosophen verbunden ist: *Sane mira sapientia <phi>losophorum, cuius infirmitatem prima haec contestatur uarietas <o>pinionum, ueniens de ignorantia ueritatis.*[34] An einigen Stellen benennt der Theologe aus Karthago auch ganz direkt "die entgegengesetzten Meinungen der Philosophen und Ketzer und jene alte Geschichte bei Platon" (so die Übersetzung von Jan Hendrik Waszink: *scilicet opiniones philosophorum et haereticorum et illum sermonem Platonis ueternosum*[35]) oder die "alte, nur im Gedächtnis Platons fortlebende Erzählung" (*Quis ille nunc uetus sermo apud memoriam Platonis*[36]). Wenn es um "Ketzereien" geht, bestreitet Tertullian gerade deren Alter. Weder Apelles noch Markion gehören der alten Zeit an: *Si et Apellis stemma retractandum est, tam non uetus et ipse quam Marcion institutor et praeformator eius.*[37] Im Gegenteil, *ueterem doctrinam* bezieht Tertullian einmal in

antimarkionitischen Argumentationen auf Zusammenhänge aus alttestamentlichen Zeiten.[38] Abschließend könnte man nun noch die Frage nach dem Kontext der Passage stellen, mit der wir uns beschäftigt haben: Woher hätte ein Leser Tertullians wissen sollen, daß *quaedam uetus opinio* nun ausgerechnet die "gnostische Lehre" in der Deutung des Irenaeus bezeichnen wollte? Man wird also eine moderne Argumentation über die historische Zuverlässigkeit des häresiologischen Schemas von Irenaeus nicht mit Tertullian belegen dürfen—ob eine Gnosis von der Art, wie sie sich im Johannesapokryphon findet, auch für das Verständnis der authentischen Lehre Valentins bedeutsam ist, muß zuallererst an dessen Texten geklärt werden. Die neue hervorragende Synopse der komplizierten Überlieferungen dieses Textes von Michael Waldstein und Frederik Wisse stellt nun endlich jene Ausgabe dar, von der aus diese Frage u.U. neu angegangen werden kann.[39]

Soviel zur Interpretation von Irenaeus, haer. I 30,15 und Tertullian, Val. 4,2. Mir scheinen solche vergleichsweise umständlichen Detailbeobachtungen zur Interpretation von häresiologischen Referaten—und hier unterscheide ich mich von Quispel—keinen besonderen oder gar schlagenden Wert für die umstrittene Frage zu haben, ob Valentin "gewißlich ein Gnostiker war" (so Quispel) oder nicht oder nur zeitweise. Aber daß solche Stellen Aufmerksamkeit verdienen und sorgfältige Interpretation durch die Gnosisforschung lohnen, hat Quispel mit seinem jüngsten Beitrag wieder gezeigt, und darin bin ich mir mit ihm trotz aller Unterschiede vollkommen einig.

NOTES

[1] Valentinus and the Gnostikoi, *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996) 1-4.

[2] G. Quispel, Valentinus and the Gnostikoi, 4.

[3] Vgl. Ch. Markschies, Valentinus Gnosticus? Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentins (WUNT 65, Tübingen 1992) sowie ders., Alte und neue Texte und Forschungen zu Valentin und den Anfängen der "valentinianischen" Gnosis—Von J.E. Grabe und F.C. Baur bis B. Aland, in: A. Böhlig/Ch. Markschies, Gnosis und Manichäismus. Forschungen und Studien zu Valentin und Mani sowie zu den Bibliotheken von Nag Hammadi und Medinet Madi (BZNW 72, Berlin/New York 1994) 39-111.

[4] H.-M. Schenke, Rez. Markschies, Valentinus Gnosticus?, JbAC 38 (1995) 173-177, hier 173.

[5] Ch. Markschies, Valentinus Gnosticus?, 398 (vgl. auch 401).

[6] La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque II^{e}-III^{e} siècles, Tome I De Justin à Irénée, Tome II Clément d'Alexandrie et Origène, EAug, Paris 1985.

[7] Heresiography in Context (PhAnt 56) Leiden 1992.

[8] Valentinian Gnosticism: Toward the Anatomy of a School (der Text wird publiziert in den Akten der Konferenz, hg. v. J. Turner und A.M. McGuire und erscheint in NHS).

[9] Ch. Markschies, Valentinus Gnosticus?, 302-311.

[10] Haer. I 11,1 Ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης Γνωστικῆς αἱρέσεως τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεθαρμόσας, Οὐαλεντῖνος, οὕτως ὡρίσατο· (SC 264, 167, 1197-1199 Rousseau/Doutreleau); für das Verständnis des Satzes vgl. A.M. McGuire, Valentinus and the "Gnostike Hairesis," an Investigation of Valentinus's Position in the History of Gnosticism, Diss. phil., Yale 1983, 9-16 und meinen Beitrag "Valentinian Gnosticism: Toward the Anatomy of a School" (vgl. Anm. 8).

[11] Anders A. Rousseau/L. Doutreleau (SC 264, Paris 1979) 384,277-279.

[12] S. Lundström, Die Überlieferung der lateinischen Irenaeusübersetzung (AUU.SLatU, Uppsala 1985) 12; analog Quispels Übersetzung: "So foolish are the views (of the Gnostikoi), from whom the many-headed serpent, just like the Hydra of Lerma, was generated that arose from the School of Valentinus" (a.a.O. 2).

[13] In meinen Beitrag "Valentinian Gnosticism: Toward the Anatomy of a School" (vgl. Anm. 8).

[14] Haer. I praef. 2 (22,35): τῶν ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν Οὐαλεντίνου μαθητῶν.

[15] Vgl. z.B. Iren., haer. I 12,1 (181,1) und die Bemerkungen von A. Rousseau in SC 263, 236.

[16] Val. 33,1 (SC 280, 148,6 f. Fredouille).

[17] Zwei Beispiele: Die Lehre der "Ptolemaeus-Schule" wird von Irenaeus im Vorwort als ἀπάνθισμα ... τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς bezeichnet: Haer. I praef. 2 (23,44 f.); lateinisch *uelut flosculum Valentini scolae* (22,44 f.); die Barbelioten schießen wie "Pilze aus der Erde": I 29,1 (358,3).

[18] SC 263, p. 311.—Das *de* wird durch alle Handschriften belegt, so auch das Ergebnis der Kollationen für die große Irenaeus-Ausgabe in der Berliner Arbeitsstelle der "Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller," die mir freundlicherweise PD Dr. Markus Vinzent zugänglich gemacht hat.

[19] N. Brox, Irenäus von Lyon (Fontes Christiani 8/1, Freiburg u.a. 1993) 351.

[20] Die Überlieferung der lateinischen Irenaeusübersetzung (AUU.SLatU, Uppsala 1985) 12-14.

[21] Ich verstehe, wie oben schon bemerkt, *eos* als zusammenfassenden Ausdruck für die in I 29,1-30,14 verhandelten Barbelioten, Ophiten und Sethianer und diese interpretiere ich mit haer. I 11,1.

[22] Zur Abfassungszeit des Werkes vgl. Ch. Markschies, Arbeitsbuch Kirchengeschichte (UTB 1857, Tübingen 1995) 126 f.

[23] E. Klebba: "ein vielköpfiges Ungeheuer gleich der lernäischen Schlange, das aus der Schule des Valentinus entstanden ist" (BKV Irenäus I, Kempten/München 1912) 91.

[24] SC 264, 206,1 bzw. 206,130 R./D.

[25] Die Überlieferung der lateinischen Irenaeusübersetzung, 14.

[26] A.a.O. 14.

[27] Diese Theorie ist gleichwohl Ansicht des Irenaeus gewesen; aber er hat sie an anderen Stellen entfaltet, so beispielsweise in haer. I 11,1 und anderswo. Nun könnte man mit A. Le Boulluec weiter fragen, ob sie nicht letztlich auf Justin zurückgeht (La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque I, 164); diese Überlegung ist an anderer Stelle wieder aufzunehmen.

[28] B. Reynders, Lexique comparé du texte Grec et des versions Latine, Arménienne et Syriaque de l'"Adversus Haereses" de Saint Irénée, Vol. 2 Index des mots Latins (CSCO 142 Sub. 6, Louvain 1954) 133.

[29] Ch. Markschies, Valentinus Gnosticus?, 302-311. Für die Textkritik der Passage darf ich auf meine Fußnoten 73-75 auf p. 304 verweisen; ich gebe daher den entsprechend korrigierten Text, der übrigens dem Quispels entspricht und von dem bei J.-C. Fredouille abweicht (SC 280, Paris 1980, 86,9-11).

[30] G. Quispel, Valentinus and the Gnostikoi, 3.

[31] G. Quispel, Valentinus and the Gnostikoi, 4.

[32] Praesc. 7,3 bzw. 30,1; vgl. J.-C. Fredouille, SC 281, 202 f. bzw. Ch. Markschies, Valentinus Gnosticus?, 405 Anm. 102. Durch den Ausfall eines Wortes in einem Zitat bei Quispel (Valentinus and the Gnostikoi, 4 n. 9) könnte sich ein Mißverständnis nahelegen: Selbstverständlich behaupte ich nicht, daß Valentin "keine Samen gewisser alter Lehren aufgenommen hat," sondern nur, daß er "keine Samen gewisser alter Lehren *der Gnosis* aufgenommen hat" (Valentinus Gnosticus?, 405 [Hervorhebung von mir]). Das eine wäre ein expliziter Widerspruch zu Tertullians Text, das andere weist eine Interpretation eben dieses Textes ab.

[33] Apol. 47,9 (CChr.SL I, 164,35 Dekkers; Übersetzung nach C. Becker, Apologeticum, Darmstadt [3]1984, 209).

[34] Nat. II 2 (CChr.SL I, 42,2 Borleffs).—Die Dokumentation des vollständigen Belegmaterials, die den Rahmen dieses kleinen Aufsatzes sprengen würde, möchte ich mir für eine spätere Gelegenheit aufsparen.

[35] An. 36,1: CChr.SL II, 838,4-6 Waszink bzw. ders., Tertullian über die Seele (BAW.AC, Zürich/München 1980) 135.

[36] An. 28,1: 824,1 f./114.

[37] Praesc. 30,5 (CChr.SL, 211,16-18 Refoulé).

[38] Marc. IV 17,8 (CChr.SL I, 587,11-13 Kroymann); vgl. IV 21,8 (599,6 f.).

[39] The Apocryphon of John. Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1 and IV,1 with BG 8502,2 (NHS 33, Leiden u.a. 1995).

Friedrich-Schiller-Universität, Theologische Fakultät
07743 *Jena* Fürstengraben 1

THE MYSTERY OF THE FIVE SEALS: GNOSTIC INITIATION RECONSIDERED

BY

ALASTAIR H.B. LOGAN

I

Three apparently related texts from Nag Hammadi, the *Apocryphon of John* in its long recension,[1] *Trimorphic Protennoia*,[2] and the *Gospel of the Egyptians*,[3] refer in rather enigmatic fashion to "the five seals." What exactly are these "five seals"? The context and language used would appear to suggest some kind of initiatory rite or formula, involving the granting both of knowledge and of protection from death and ignorance. Thus in the hymnic passage which concludes the long recension of the *Apocryphon* the saviour figure, Pronoia, in her third and final descent, after awakening and enlightening the sleeping Gnostic, raises him up and seals him (σφραγίζειν) "in the light of the water with five seals (σφραγίς) that death might not have power over him from now on."[4] No less an authority on matters Gnostic than George MacRae thought that the best way to account for this hymnic passage was as "a Gnostic liturgical fragment probably recited at a ceremony of initiation much in the manner of a Christian baptismal homily or hymn."[5] And J.-M. Sevrin, in his exhaustive and detailed discussion of the so-called Sethian baptismal dossier of texts, develops this further. Although the usage may still be purely metaphorical, he argues that here we have in all probability a rite of quintuple baptism.[6]

Now the evidence of *Trimorphic Protennoia* does seem to confirm such an interpretation of the five seals. In the third descent of the Saviour/Protennoia figure (cf. the Pronoia of the *Apocryphon*), she describes the process of salvation of the Gnostic in terms of stripping, investing in a garment of light, robing, spring baptism, enthroning, glorifying and rapture, followed by reception of the five seals from the Light of the Mother so that he partakes of the mystery of knowledge and becomes a light in light.[7] A page later the five seals are equated with the ordinances of the Father, the glories higher than any glory: those who possess the five seals of these particular names have stripped off the garments of ignorance and put on a shining

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 188-206

light.[8] Finally on the next page Protennoia asserts that she proclaimed to the elect the ineffable five seals that she should abide in them and they in her.[9] The editor of the text in the Nag Hammadi Studies series, J.D. Turner, refers to the suggestion of an earlier editor, Gisela Schenke, that at each stage of the Sethian baptismal rite a divine name was invoked and the person being baptised was provided with a seal, but he himself thinks it more likely that the five seals "are a single baptismal rite consisting of the five stages of enlightenment noted above: investiture, spring baptism, enthronement, glorification and ecstatic rapture."[10] On the other hand, Yvonne Janssens, in her edition, conjectures that the five seals represent anointings of the five sense organs.[11]

Does our final witness, the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, cast any more light? Certainly its even more allusive references to the five seals might appear to offer some support to these interpretations of the "five seals" as part of a rite of initiation. Thus the passage introducing the final hymnic section does refer, at least in the Codex III version, to the five seals in the context of baptism, invocation, renunciation and freedom from experiencing death.[12] But the Codex IV version omits the number, and earlier on the five seals appear as heavenly figures alongside the triad of Father, Mother and Son as apparently produced by the Father,[13] and as associated with the saving missions of Pronoia and heavenly Seth.[14] Thus the editors of the text in the Nag Hammadi Studies series, Böhlig and Wisse, prefer to interpret the five seals not primarily as sacramental (here they allude to the five sacraments some have claimed to find in the *Gospel of Philip*),[15] but as the figures of triple-male child, Youel and Esephech, five images of the primal triad of Father, Mother and Son.[16] The references to "five seals" as sacramental are therefore to be seen as secondary.[17]

However, Sevrin rightly stresses the liturgical, baptismal character of the entire work, and he ingeniously reconciles the two interpretations: the five seals are primarily baptismal, but have been given archetypes in the Pleroma. It is more a matter of the five seals being dependent on baptismal representation than the reverse, the rite as reconstructed by him involving fivefold immersion rather than insignation.[18] But despite some similarities in language, seal being, as he notes, a "classic designation of Christian baptism,"[19] he is led to deny the Christian character of the rite he finds underlying all three texts, precisely from the five seals and the apparent lack of any mention of unction. He ascribes the rite to a Barbelo-Sethian baptising sect of Jewish origin, while candidly admitting that it has nothing in common with Judaeo-baptist practices.

II

So which is the right interpretation? Is it a matter of a genuine rite and if so, to what do the five seals refer? Most commentators accept the secondary Christian character of these texts and are forced back to rather implausible appeals to hypothetical Jewish originals and baptismal rituals. But what if the myth underlying these texts—for there are clear structural similarities between them—and the ritual from which the myth was developed—for that is the more usual pattern in such cases—were *fundamentally* Christian, derived from the paradigm of the heavenly birth, anointing and elevation of the Son, Christ, and based on contemporary early second century "mainstream" Christian rites of initiation (water baptism and chrismation or sealing)? What if the Gnostics or Barbelognostics of these texts, imitated by the Valentinians, whom Irenaeus claims derived their mythological schemes from them,[20] were the first to introduce or exploit post-baptismal chrism with ointment (μύρον) understood as "sealing," the "seal of the Spirit" in connection with their claim to be the real Christians?[21]

Thus Irenaeus, probably summarising the spectrum of Valentinian views of "redemption," after alluding to their contrast between the psychic baptism of Jesus and their superior, spiritual baptism introduced by Christ, refers to some who baptise in water in the name of Father, Mother and Christ followed by anointing with balsam oil, while others baptise with a mixture of oil and water and then anoint with balsam.[22] He goes on to mention a death-bed rite involving affusion of oil mixed with water or balsam mixed with water on the head to free the initiate from the hostile powers.[23] And the tombstone in Rome of the evidently Valentinian Flavia Sophe speaks of her as "anointed (χρίειν) in the baths (λουτρόν) of Christ with incorruptible, holy ointment (χρίσμα)."[24] And this in turn recalls Celsus' description of an Ophite (i.e. Gnostic) death rite involving a person called "Father" conferring a seal (σφραγίς) on another called "Son," who responds "I am anointed (χρίειν) with white (i.e. gleaming?) chrism from the tree of life." Celsus also mentions the good light angels who transmit the seal standing on one side of the departing soul with evil archontic ones on the other.[25] Origen's revealing comment is that Celsus has not understood the Christian term "seal."

Now although the Valentinian rites of initiation do clearly include chrism,[26] the mythologoumenon of the pre-temporal anointing of the heavenly Son as Christ is absent from their myth, whereas as I have recently

argued it is crucial to the myth and ritual of the Gnostics of Irenaeus and the *Apocryphon* and related texts, from which the Valentinians would seem to have adopted it, ever on the lookout for good ideas to plunder.[27] Thus all three of the texts cited as well as Irenaeus' summary of the Barbelognostics feature the pre-temporal anointing of the heavenly Son as Christ.[28] Further, the fullest account, that in the *Apocryphon*, has the Father see himself reflected in the living water of the Spirit which results in the origin of the Mother, Barbelo, who bears the Son, who is then anointed with the goodness of the supreme Spirit.[29] This archetypal pattern is then repeated in the case of a Gnostic elect soul: once it becomes conscious of its real state through the saving knowledge and repents, it is reborn (through baptism in living water) and has the Spirit descend on it (through chrismation or sealing).[30]

This pattern seems confirmed by the—admittedly—allusive language of the Naassene Preaching and Psalm, the work, note, of those who dub themselves "gnostics."[31] It too speaks of the need for the regeneration by water and the Spirit of the Gnostic in the image of the perfect man,[32] Adamas, describing the promise of baptism (βαπτίσμα) as the introduction into unfading pleasure of the person washed with living water and anointed (χρίειν) with ineffable chrism (χρίσμα).[33] Indeed the Naassenes claim that they alone are Christians completing the mystery at the third gate and being anointed (χρίειν) there with ineffable chrism (χρίσμα) from a horn, like David.[34] And of course the Naassene Psalm has Jesus descend to the benighted soul with the seals (σφραγίς) to reveal all mysteries and transmit the saving knowledge.[35]

Thus all these texts which relate to those who appear to identify themselves or can be identified as "Gnostics" seem to attest a unified rite of initiation involving baptism in living water followed by chrismation with an ointment of some sort (myrrh, i.e. balsam, perhaps oil in some cases)[36] as a seal, which makes them Christians and symbolises possession of saving knowledge, protection from the hostile archons and the presence of the Holy Spirit.[37] Looking again in the light of this evidence at the texts with which we began, can we put more flesh on the bare bones and answer our opening question about the five seals more positively?

The evidence both of the structure of the myth and the Valentinian formulae suggests that the Gnostic initiates were first baptised in living water probably in the name of the supreme triad or Trinity of Father, Mother/Barbelo and Son/Christ, the mystery and goal of the entire development of the Pleroma, and the content of the knowledge possessed by the supreme heavenly Man, Adamas, in whose image we humans were

formed.[38] The baptismal hymn at the end of the *Gospel of the Egyptians* seems to hint at this, with its allusions to the mysterious threefold name Iesseus Mazareus Iessedekeus, to the supreme God, the self-begotten Son and the Mother and to the shaping or forming of the initiate.[39] The last recalls the ideas of the Naassene Preaching about the unformed Son forming the Gnostics through baptism.[40] More striking still is the threefold baptismal formula of the Valentinians quoted by Irenaeus: "Into the name of the unknown Father of all things, Into Truth, the Mother of all, into him who descended on Jesus (i.e. Christ)," very probably borrowed from such a threefold pattern among the Gnostics since elsewhere in the Valentinian literature we tend to find the more usual trinitarian formula.[41] The similarity but difference of the Gnostic Trinity to that of "mainstream" Christians is surely no coincidence!

If then baptism evidently represents the rebirth of the Gnostic and his/her acquiring knowledge, spiritual formation and a true identity, the five seals rite must mark not only chrismation (the Gnostic becoming anointed as Christ/Christian) but also sealing (protection against external evil forces, the promise of immortality and the gift of the Spirit). As we have seen, these elements are present in various ways in our Gnostic texts, particularly the *Apocryphon.* But can we be more specific? The elements involved in sealing would imply the use of myrrh (i.e. olive oil mixed with balsam or other such sweet scented product) rather than plain oil:[42] the baptismal hymn in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* has the initiate refer to myrrh mixed with water;[43] myrrh's sweet savour would suggest the presence of the Holy Spirit; more significantly it was used to embalm and thus promise immortality, and this last fact might help unlock the riddle of the five seals. Janssens, as we saw, suggested that in *Trimorphic Protennoia* the five seals referred to anointing the five organs of sense: eyes, ears, nostrils, mouth, hands. Certainly embalming would involve stuffing the first four with myrrh. So this is one plausible explanation.

But I would like to suggest another. In the *Apocryphon* salvation involves the soul, not the body. Certainly the initiated soul is required to live an ascetic life, but the temptations to avoid are surely more psychic than physical: the whole myth revolves round visions and voices, true and counterfeit spirits. Thus I would like to suggest that what were anointed were the organs for which souls can be assumed to possess equivalents: two eyes, two ears and a mouth. Further, such anointing I surmise would be in the name of the Self-Begotten, Christ and his four accompanying guardian angels, who clearly play a central role in the Gnostic myth.[44] Each organ

would be anointed with a special formula in the name of one of the five. This could explain both the passages where the five seals appear to be formulae associated with names, as in *Trimorphic Protennoia*,[45] and those where they are heavenly beings directly related to the Father, Mother and Son, as in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*.[46] Precisely because baptism in the name of Father, Mother and Son is followed by chrismation involving the five seals, a redactor has hypostatised the five as five heavenly archetypes immediately following Father, Mother and Son. Finally the seals might be interpreted as talismans, as in the Naassene Psalm,[47] symbols giving the ascending soul power over Ialdabaoth and his archons.[48]

III

I have attempted to sketch out the origins and development of this "classic Gnostic myth" of Irenaeus and the *Apocryphon* elsewhere, suggesting that it probably originated in Syrian Antioch in the opening decades of the second century C.E., in reaction to the final rejection of the Christians by the Jews.[49] But is there any other evidence to support such a conjecture of a group in Antioch or environs claiming to be Christian from their practice of post-baptismal chrismation? Long established orthodoxy has denied any evidence of post-baptismal chrismation in Syria before the late fourth century.[50] It has been argued that earlier Syrian baptismal practice evidently had anointing the head with oil *before* baptism signifying the gift of the Spirit, in imitation both of Old Testament priestly and kingly anointing and of Jesus' baptism in Jordan as symbolising the inauguration of his Messianic kingship:[51] the Gnostic practice here is anointing the head with myrrh *after* baptism. Clearly the Western Valentinians known to Irenaeus practiced the latter and "mainstream" Christians did something similar;[52] is there any evidence that Eastern Christians did so, or were aware of such practices as the basis of or a parallel to the Gnostic usage? I would like to draw attention to three pieces of evidence which might suggest that at least some Christian groups in the area of Syria and Asia Minor in the early to middle second century did indeed practice post-baptismal chrism with myrrh.[53]

First there is 1 John whose polemic is entirely directed at those who claimed to be Christians but who had seceded, refusing to identify Christ with Jesus. The author identifies them as unloving, exclusive antichrists claiming to walk in the light and be free from sin, rejecting Jesus' commands and the evidence of the Spirit, the water and the blood (of Christ

and hence the crucifixion, but also by extension the eucharist). R.E. Brown, in his persuasive analysis of the situation in the Johannine community, draws attention to the way the author has to accept that the seceders too have received chrism (χρίσμα: 1 John 2:20, 27), which he allows could well designate an actual sacramental rite.[54] Further, in an evident attempt to reject the seceders' claims to have superior knowledge about Christ and to pass it on by teaching, the author appeals to the proper knowledge possessed by his group which needs no teacher but the chrism itself (i.e. the Holy Spirit). Brown plausibly suggests that the seceders' attitude could readily lead to the developed ideas and systems of the Gnostics, aided, even catalysed by their interpretation of John's Gospel.[55] This is exactly what seems to have happened to the Gnostics stemming from Antioch identified by me, who were much akin to the Johannine community in their rejection of Judaism, their elitism and their high Christology, and who were increasingly influenced by the Fourth Gospel.[56] If they practiced post-baptismal chrism with myrrh as a sign of the gift of the Spirit could not their spiritual ancestors attacked by 1 John have done so too?

Now Brown has suggested Ephesus as the likely location for these events,[57] and a similar, if not more advanced scenario seems to underlie the slightly later polemic of Ignatius of Antioch in *his* letter to the Ephesians. He too attacks those who claim to be Christians (7,1) while not attending the eucharist and denying the reality of Christ's sufferings. These are no straw men; he is aware of their having visited Ephesus with their evil teaching (9,1). Against them, as with 1 John, Ignatius' famous paradoxes are intended to insist that Jesus and Christ are one being (8,2). In a vivid metaphor he appeals to Father, Son, and Spirit and the commands of Christ (9,1). And he too urges the importance of love, not just faith (14), and extols silence over plausible teaching, warning of the fate of eternal punishment for false teaching about Jesus (15-16). And as with 1 John, his response seems to involve an appeal to sacramental practice. Thus he begins by stressing that Christ received ointment (μύρον) on his head (cf. Matt. 26:7) to breathe immortality on the Church, urging his hearers not to be anointed with the evil odour of the doctrine of the prince of this world.[58] Next he proceeds to emphasise the centrality of the cross and of Jesus' real birth and baptism to "purify the water" (18-19). Then follows the famous section on Mary's virginity, the destruction of magic and the planned abolition of death, and a postscript in which he promises to continue the theme emphasising the need to meet together and celebrate the eucharist, the "medicine of immortality" (20).

The sacramental emphasis, then, is obvious in this section. As regards a possible rite of chrism, notice the use of the term myrrh, not oil, and the interpretation in terms of Christ breathing immortality on the Church. The combination of ideas can most plausibly be taken to refer to the gift and odour of the Holy Spirit promising eternal life.[59] Ignatius' order of treatment (myrrh, baptism, eucharist) need not be chronological; after all the anointing of Jesus' head in Matthew 26:7 as paradigm for post-baptismal unction *follows* his baptism.[60] More significantly, the allusion is not cathartic or exorcistic; indeed that Jesus' baptism was to purify the water surely implies there is no need for any kind of pre-baptismal chrism for that purpose. The cumulative evidence suggests even more strongly than in the case of 1 John that Ignatius' most likely opponents here were my Gnostics with their practice of baptism followed by chrism, something which Ignatius seems implicitly to accept, and this might furnish further support to the hypothesis that in *some* communities and groups in Syria and Asia Minor in the second century baptism was followed by chrism with myrrh signifying the gift of the Spirit.[61]

The final piece of evidence is the myron or ointment prayer in a Coptic fragment of the *Didache*.[62] This occurs at the end of chapter 10, usually interpreted as eucharistic, and very much parallels the prayers over the cup and the bread in 9,1-3, laying down thanksgiving for the perfume (Coptic *stinoufi*) made known through Christ, God's son (Coptic *shēri*). Now there is a very similar but longer Greek version in a corresponding position in book 7 of the *Apostolic Constitutions*,[63] which is usually attributed to a compiler working in Antioch around 380, and using the *Didache* as a key source.[64] The general consensus, working from the variants and context, is that the compiler, a conservative and most likely author of the pseudo-Ignatian epistles,[65] found the prayer in his version of the *Didache* and accommodated it and the newly introduced post-baptismal chrismation with μύρον to his Syrian initiation pattern of pre-baptismal anointings, episcopal and diaconal, with oil.[66] But the question arises, since the prayer is not found in the Bryennius MS (H) or the Georgian version, could it possibly be authentic? E. Peterson thought so, explaining that the editors of H were Novatianists who rejected chrism,[67] while S. Gero defended it by explaining it as modelled on a Jewish prayer over incense at the end of the thanksgiving meal, his interpretation of *Did.* 10.[68] The latest editor of the *Didache*, K. Niederwimmer, argues against its authenticity, making much of the difficulty defenders of genuineness have in explaining why it was apparently omitted by H.[69] He suggests that the prayer, whose precise nature

as either intended for the oil used to anoint the sick or for chrism remains for him an open question, was modelled on the style of the prayers of 9,1-3 and interpolated perhaps as early as the third century.[70]

But if one rejects the defences of Peterson and Gero as implausible, can a case be made out for the genuineness of the ointment prayer? I think it can for the following reasons. First, Niederwimmer's suggested provenance and criticisms of genuineness can be countered. As regards provenance, why should a forger/interpolator produce such an ambiguous prayer at such an awkward location in the text? Indeed why should he bother to create an archaicising ointment prayer modelled on the examples in 9,1-3 in the East in the third century, when the evidence suggests the norm was pre-baptismal anointing with *oil*?[71] In his review of Niederwimmer's edition, S.G. Hall has attempted to undermine Niederwimmer's objection that the ointment prayer does not echo the *spiritual* character of the prayers over cup and bread; he claims that the reference to the εὐωδία underlying the Coptic represents that.[72] In response to Niederwimmer's other major objection, why should H and the Georgian have omitted it if genuine, I would repeat the point already made; with pre-baptismal anointing with oil becoming increasingly the norm, any evidence of another form of chrism would have been overlooked or even suppressed, particularly if it was tainted by association with Gnostics.

Second there is the evidence of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the links with Antioch. The compiler clearly wanted to enlist the most ancient traditions, and his version of the ointment prayer reflects a combination of his text of the *Didache* with language taken from Ignatius, *Eph.* 17,1, with which he was so familiar, as in all likelihood author of the Pseudo-Ignatian letters.[73] He is championing his own local traditions, perhaps having discovered a more original form of the *Didache* as authority for introducing the post-baptismal chrism with myrrh, for which he evidently finds it difficult to establish a rationale, rather than unwillingly accepting an outside tradition from Jerusalem or elsewhere.[74] Gero's objection about the Coptic *stinoufi* as not the normal translation of μύρον can be countered by noting that *stinoufi* is an exact rendering of the εὐωδίας τοῦ μύρου of *Ap. Con.* 7,27,2; the translator used that to refer to the μύρον of the original.[75]

Third, developing Peterson's illuminating point that the eucharistic and ointment prayers share the concept εὐχαριστία,[76] what the *Didache*'s prayers do is not sanctify the elements (water, bread, chrism etc.) as in later Eastern rites, but give thanks for them, reflecting the much more ancient Jewish understanding and practice.[77] Wine, bread and myrrh are human products

involved in sacramental acts, and the placing of the ointment prayer after the eucharistic giving of thanks is perfectly appropriate. That the compiler of *Ap. Con.* does not have a prayer of blessing or sanctification of the ointment, as in the case of the oil and baptismal water, but merely a prayer during chrismation requesting the activation of the myrrh, for which a thanksgiving has already been made, reveals both the changes in liturgical thinking that have taken place and the high regard the compiler has for the *Didache* and its ointment prayer.[78] Moreover, the Western evidence from Cyprian that the oil of post-baptismal anointing was that sanctified on the altar in the eucharist[79] might suggest that a similar situation and logic underlies the *Didache*'s positioning of its ointment prayer: thanksgiving for the myrrh for the post-baptismal chrismation came after the thanksgiving for the eucharistic elements.[80] What Jesus came to make known according to the *Didache*'s prayer was probably the myrrh of Matthew 26:7, interpreted as what made the initiates Christians, administered after baptism, perhaps when the baptised joined the community for their first eucharist.

Thus there might indeed be evidence to suggest that some communities in the East, Gnostic and "mainstream" Christian, did practice post-baptismal chrism with myrrh as the "seal of the Spirit," that which made one a real Christian. The fragmented nature of such communities and diversity of practice might explain why we find no trace of such—or any—chrism in the *First Apology* of Justin Martyr, for example, who was active in Ephesus and Rome in the middle of the second century. Conversely, the language of Theophilus of Antioch, defending the name "Christian" from the fact of Christians being anointed with the oil of God, would appear to support the existence of a rite of chrism in Antioch in the later second century: indeed his cleansing analogies and reference to oil might suggest the pre-baptismal version.[81] And the absence of the ointment prayer in texts of the *Didache* like H may be ascribed to the falling into disuse or suppression of alternative forms with the growing predominance in Syria of pre-baptismal chrism with oil, such as Theophilus may attest. Indeed Theophilus' link of "Christian" with chrismation may help unravel the enigma of early Syrian initiation.

For the fundamental point is that we should consider the introduction of different patterns of chrismation as ultimately determined by the theology underlying the practice. The key to understanding the differences may very well lie in how the anointing of Christ as paradigm for Christian initiation was understood, and when it was supposed to have taken place.

Appeal to the earthly baptism of Jesus as paradigm may be something of a red herring. Thus the Gnostic order and use of myrrh correspond perfectly to their theology of initiation as patterned on the primal chrismation of the Son and probably spread West via the Valentinians.[82] If the evidence of 1 John and Ignatius is less clear-cut about the actual existence of a rite of chrism involving myrrh and how it was understood, certainly the sacramental theology and practice implied by the *Didache*, assuming its ointment prayer to be original, makes perfect sense, taking Jesus' chrismation on the head with myrrh as the paradigm for a post-baptismal anointing. But such examples of post-baptismal chrism with myrrh as sealing probably died out in Syria and the neighbouring areas for various reasons, not so much perhaps because of an association with Gnosticism (although that is possible), but more likely because of the growing predominance of a different interpretation of Christ's anointing. This saw Christian initiation as imitating Christ's pre-incarnational Messianic inauguration (cf. Luke 4:18/Isa. 61:1-2) with the presence of the Spirit outwardly symbolised by chrismation with oil, the "oil of gladness" (cf. Ps. 44:8 LXX), which naturally should take place before baptism.[83]

Despite the ingenious interpretations of Winkler and others, appealing to OT priestly/kingly anointing and imitation of the baptism of Jesus, it is surely significant that no attempt seems to have been made in the early Syrian sources either to exploit the order and instrument of the priestly anointing of Exodus 30:22-33 (namely washing followed by anointing with an oil and aromatic plant mixture, i.e. μύρον), or to imitate exactly the earthly baptism of Jesus, which has the Spirit descend *after* the baptism. On the other hand what both Gnostic and "orthodox" Syrian Christians do seem to point up in their interpretation of Christian initiation is the primordial or preincarnational chrismation of Christ. But whereas the Gnostics chose to imitate the birth and primordial chrismation of the heavenly Son by following water baptism with the—for them—more fundamental chrismation with μύρον, marking the descent of the Spirit, Syrian "orthodox" Christians chose to put the more important chrismation as sealing with olive oil first. Later on factors such as a change from an earlier more Jewish understanding of initiation to a more Gentile one, and a move to a more Pauline understanding of baptism in terms of dying and rising (Romans 6), coupled with the greater influx of Gentiles, led to the fencing off of the sacraments by preparatory and exorcistic rites, causing the evident reduplication of the single pre-baptismal anointing with oil, and/or the introduction of a post-baptismal chrismation. To this, now interpreted

as modelled on Jesus' post-baptismal chrismation by the Spirit, was transferred the symbolism of new birth, sonship and the gift of the Spirit.[84] Thus the "orthodox" were finally to exhibit a parallel to the views of the Gnostics, as, by another irony, it was the Valentinians, according to E.A. Leeper, who spearheaded the introduction of exorcistic elements into Western liturgies![85]

Thus almost all trace of a post-baptismal chrismation with myrrh disappeared in Syria until it suddenly emerged in Jerusalem with Cyril (or John)[86] and was rediscovered in Antioch by the compiler of *Ap. Con.*[87] It is intriguing to note that, about the same time, Epiphanius was describing the attitudes of the Archontics of Palestine, possessors of books about Seth and late representatives of my Gnostics, towards sacraments: they condemn baptism, even though some were previously baptised, rejecting participation in the sacraments as extraneous and introduced by Sabaoth, god of the Jews.[88] Whenever the Archontic soul acquires γνῶσις and shuns the baptism of the Church and the name of Sabaoth, it ascends through the seven heavens to the Mother and Father of all, defending itself before each of the archons. Reading between the lines of Epiphanius' polemic, which makes great play on the ideas of perfume and the deadly effect of orthodox baptism and sweet fragrance (i.e. εὐωδία) on such heretics,[89] one surmises that these Gnostics practised their own form of baptismal initiation,[90] rejecting the "orthodox" Christian version. What is equally intriguing is Epiphanius' information that Peter, the source of the heresy, had been a presbyter in the Jerusalem area who had participated in the Gnostic αἵρεσις.[91] Could Peter have passed on to Jerusalem Christians the Gnostic idea of a post-baptismal anointing with μύρον of the organs of sense, which Cyril in the 350s is apparently the first to attest?[92] The wheel may well have come full circle, but the parting of the ways is complete.

NOTES

1 NHC II,*1* and IV,*1*.

2 NHC XIII,*1*.

3 NHC III,*2* and IV,*2*.

4 NHC II 31,22-25/IV 49,1-6 (very fragmentary but very similar).

5 "Sleep and Awakening in Gnostic Texts" in U. Bianchi ed., *Le origini dello gnosticismo* (Supplements to *Numen* 12) (Leiden 1967) 468-507, esp. 502.

6 *Le dossier baptismale Séthien: Etudes sur la sacramentaire gnostique* (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, Section "Etudes" 2) (Québec 1986) 31-38, cf. also 250-258.

7 NHC XIII 48,12-35. The text is fragmentary but the reconstructions of J.D. Turner

in *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, XIII* (Nag Hammadi Studies 28) (Leiden/New York/Copenhagen/Köln 1990) 428, seem plausible.

[8] 49,20-32.

[9] 50,9-12.

[10] *Op. cit.* 452-453. But against that interpretation (a) more than five stages are enumerated if you count stripping and giving light/knowledge, and (b) the reception of the seals seems a later, distinct action. The recent sketch by Schenke (now Robinson), "The Trimorphic Protennoia and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel" in J.E. Goehring *et al.* eds., *Gnosticism & the Early Christian World* (Sonoma, Cal. 1990) 37-50, summarises her developed view of the initiation as a five-stage baptism with four gifts bestowed at every stage, and the five seals as five mysterious names with a seal bestowed as each name is called out 41-4), assuming the non-Christian nature of the Sethian group.

[11] *La Prôtennoia Trimorphe (NH XIII,1)* (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi Section "Textes" 4) (Québec 1978), 80.

[12] Cf. NHC III 65,26-66,8/IV 78,1-10. Both are garbled: III reads: "the renunciations (ἀπόταξις) of the five seals (σφραγίς) in the spring (πηγή) baptism (βάπτισμα)" and IV refers to "the baptisms of the renunciation (ἀποταγή) and the ineffable seals of [their] baptism (βάπτισμα)."

[13] Cf. IV 56,23-57,1; 58,3-8, 23-59,4.

[14] Cf. IV 58,23-59,29; III 62,24-63,4/IV 74,9-17. At III 55,11-16/IV 66,25-67,1 the five, described as being in charge of the myriads, are given command to reveal [the truth?] to those who are worthy.

[15] A. Böhlig and F. Wisse eds., *Nag Hammadi Codices III,2 and IV,2: The Gospel of the Egyptians* (Nag Hammadi Studies 4) (Leiden 1975), 174 with reference to H.-G. Gaffron, *Studien zum koptischen Philippusevangelium unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sakramente*, (Bonn 1969).

[16] *Op. cit.* 50, 197.

[17] *Op. cit.* 174.

[18] *Op. cit.* ch. 3 esp. 110-117. The very allusive passage in the Bala'izah Gnostic fragment (see Paul E. Kahle, *Bala'izah: Coptic Texts fom Deir El-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt* 2 vols. (Oxford 1954) 1.437-477; W.E. Crum, "A Gnostic Fragment," *Journal of Theological Studies* 44 (1943) 176-179), which refers to initiates who partake of Paradise sealing the five powers in silence, and mentions the allegory of the five trees and has John acknowledge his completion of knowledge (γνῶσις) and a hidden mystery, seems to reflect this initiatory background and understanding: the five trees probably represent five heavenly revealer/redeemer figures. See further below.

[19] Cf. e.g. Hermas, *Sim.* 9,16,3-4: "the seal (σφραγίς) is the water"; *2 Clement* 6,9; 7,6; 8,6.

[20] *Adv. haer.* 1,30,15; 31,3; 2,13,8,10.

[21] Cf. G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London 1951, [2]1967) 120 ff. The Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* 1,45-8 seem to represent an alternative, clearly Jewish-Christian, interpretation of a pre-incarnate anointing of Christ: the title "Christ," applied to Jewish kings, derives from Christ's primary anointing with oil from the tree of life because he, the true prophet, was to become human, although the Son of God and beginning (*initium*) of everything. Hence he anoints those pious who reach the kingdom of God after a hard struggle as rest for their labours with similar oil, that their light shine and, filled with the Holy Spirit, they be granted immortality. The composite ointment of Aaron's

anointing in Exod. 29 and 30 from which all kings, priests and prophets derive, is an earthly copy of that heavenly pure original, and Christ, anointed a priest then born of the waters, ended priestly, prophetic and kingly chrism.

[22] *Adv. haer.* 1,21,2-4; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 34,20,7-8. Note the clear distinction between oil and balsam and the interpretation of the balsam as a type of the sweet savour (εὐωδία ?) above all terrestrial things.

[23] 1,21,5; Epiph. *Pan.* 36,2,4-8. On the latter mixture cf. *Gosp. Eg.* III 67,22-24/IV 80,9-12: the Coptic term *stoei* can render the Greek μύρον, cf. W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford 1972) 362b-363a s.v. *stoi.*

[24] See G. Quispel, "L'inscription de Flavia Sophe," *Gnostic Studies* 1 (Istanbul 1974), 58-69. Text in *CIG* IV 594 no. 9595a.

[25] Origen, *C. Cels.* 6,27. The number seven spoken by the angels probably refers to the seven archontic spheres to be traversed. Cf. 6,31.

[26] Cf. also *Gosp. Phil.* NHC II 67,5, 23-30; 69,4-14; 74,12-24; *On the Anointing A* NHC XI,*2* 40, 8-29. E. Segelberg, "The Baptismal Rite according to some of the Coptic-Gnostic Texts of Nag Hammadi," F.L. Cross ed., *Studia Patristica* 5, Part III Liturgica, Monastica et Ascetica (TU 80) (Berlin 1962) 117-128, stresses the centrality of chrism for both the *Gospel of Truth* (NHC I,*2*), which he interprets as a "confirmation homily" (120), and *Gos. Phil.*

[27] See my *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy* (Edinburgh 1996), esp. ch. 2. Note the use in Iren. 1,21,3/Epiph. *Pan.* 34,20,3-5 of what are apparently Palestinian Aramaic formulae (cf. H. Gressmann, "Jüdisch-Aramaisches bei Epiphanius," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 16 (1916) 191-197) which would be in line with the likely Antiochene and Syrian origin of my Gnostics.

[28] Cf. *Apoc. John* BG 29,18-31,5/NHC III 9,10-10,9; NHC II 6,10-33; *Trim. Prot.* NHC XIII 37,20-38,10; *Gosp. Eg.* NHC III 44,22-24/IV 55,11-14; Iren. *Adv. Haer.* 1,29,1.

[29] *Apoc. John* BG 26,15-27,19 and par; BG 29,18-31,5 and par.

[30] Cf. BG 64,14-71,2 and par.

[31] Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5,2,6,3-4.

[32] 5,7,40; 8,10,37-8.

[33] 5,7,19.

[34] 5,9,22. Cf. 1 Samuel 16:13; 10:1.

[35] 5,10,1-2. On the Naassenes as members of the same Gnostic sect, see *Gnostic Truth* 49.

[36] Cf. the Ophites of Celsus: the "white (λευκός) chrism" may refer to gleaming olive oil. But the Naassene references to "ineffable chrism" may suggest ointment rather than oil, despite the David reference.

[37] Cf. the *Hypostasis of the Archons* NHC II,*4* 96,15-97,21, with a similar concatenation of elements: the True Man (i.e. Christ) in creaturely form, the Spirit of Truth sent by the Father, to teach and anoint with the chrism (χρίσμα) of eternal life, resulting in trampling the powers to death and ascending to the Infinite Light, coming to know Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

[38] Cf. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1,29,3; *Apoc. John* BG 34,19-35,20 and par; 47,14-49,9 and par. However, baptism could have been in the name of the Self-Begotten Son, the Autogenes/Christ; cf. *Gosp. Eg.* III 66,22-24 and *Zostrianos* NHC VIII,*1* 6,7-22 where Zostrianos undergoes a series of baptisms in the name of the Self-Begotten God.

[39] Cf. *Gosp. Eg.* III 66,8-67,22/IV 78,10-80,8. On this cluster of ideas cf. *Apocalypse of*

Adam NHC V,*5* 85,22-31, which refers to Adam's secret knowledge (γνῶσις) as the holy baptism of those who know the eternal knowledge (γνῶσις) through the Logos-begotten and the incorruptible luminaries (φωστήρ), who came forth from the holy sowing, Iesseus [Maz]areus [Iesse]dekeus, the [living] water. Iesseus . . . cannot refer to Jesus who for the Gnostics is a creature of the lower world.

[40] Cf. Hipp. *Ref.* 5,7,33; 8,14-22.

[41] Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1,21,3 (see n. 27 on the following Aramaic formulae). For the trinitarian language of the Great Church cf. e.g. *Exc. ex Theod.* 76,3-4—a quotation of Matt. 28:19; *Gosp. Phil.* 67,9-27. Although the *Tripartite Tractate* has its distinctive formula (NHC I,*5* 56,30-59,10: Father, Son and Church) it too echoes the Catholic version (cf. 127,25-128,19: baptism/redemption into Father, Son, and Holy Spirit).

[42] Cf. Clem. Alex. *Paed.* 2,8,62,3 on μύρον as adulterated oil.

[43] III 67,22-24/IV 80,9-12. See n. 23. To translate *stoi* as incense (so Böhlig/Wisse *Gospel* 160-161) rather than myrrh is surely less likely, if it is described as "mixed with water." The original Greek term could have been εὐωδία. See n. 75 below.

[44] Cf. e.g. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1,29,2; *Apoc. John* BG 35,20-36,15; 51,1-52,1; *Gosp. Eg.* III 56,13-22; *Hyp. Arch.* 93,8-end; *Zost.* 29,1-20. Note also the guardian angels transmitting the seal in Orig. *C. Cels.* 6,27; as suggested above (n. 25), the number seven associated with them probably relates to the seven archontic spheres.

[45] Cf. *Trim. Prot.* 49,20-32.

[46] Cf. IV 56,23-57,1; 58,3-8, 23-59,2; III 55,9-16. See n. 18 on the Bala'izah fragment: its "five powers" which are sealed in silence might be the five senses, thus corroborating Janssens' interpretation.

[47] Hipp. *Ref.* 5,10,2.

[48] The enigmatic language of Origen's ascending Ophites, protected by a "spirit of Pronoia and by Sophia" (cf. *Apoc. John* BG 67,1-14; II 31,11-25), who refer to a symbol in the type of life, a superior pentad, or in the type of the tree of life etc. (*C. Cels.* 6,31), may be a coded reference to the five seals as such talismans.

[49] See *Gnostic Truth* ch. 2.

[50] Cf. e.g. E.C. Whittaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* (London [2]1970) xv f.; S.P. Brock, "Studies in the Early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 23 (1972) 16-64, esp. 24; id., "The Transition to a Post-Baptismal Anointing in the Antiochene Rite" in B.D. Spinks ed., *The Sacrifice of Praise* (Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 19) (Rome 1981) 215; P. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (London 1992) 163 f.

[51] Cf. G. Winkler, "The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and its Implications," *Worship* 52 (1978) 24-45, etc.; Bradshaw, *Search* 163-171.

[52] For the latter cf. Tert. *De Bapt.* 7,1-2 (note that he is reacting to Cainite, i.e. Gnostic practice, although he only refers to oil); Cyprian Ep. 70,2 (again oil, blessed in the eucharist).

[53] Note Bradshaw's conclusion on the diversity and regional variety of early forms of initiation, *Search* 183 f.

[54] *The Epistles of John* (Anchor Bible 30) (London 1983) 342-5. For support of this interpretation see G. Dix, "Confirmation or Laying on of Hands?" (*Theology* Occasional Papers 5) (London 1936), 10; L.S. Thornton, *Confirmation, its Place in the Baptismal Mystery* (London 1954) 21; J. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology* (Graecitas Christianorum

Primaeva 1) (Nijmegen 1962) 263. To interpret the order Spirit, water, blood in 1 John 5:7 f. as referring to pre-baptismal unction, baptism and the eucharist, as suggested by e.g. T.W. Manson, "Entry into Membership of the Early Church" *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1947) 25-33 etc., might seem at first sight plausible, in the light of later Syrian evidence (see however the criticisms of Brown, *Epistles* 583 f., and Lampe, *Seal* 87-91 and my own proposals below).

[55] Cf. 69-71, 104-106, 112-114. L.L. Mitchell, *Baptismal Anointing* (Alcuin Club Collections 48) (London 1966) 50, sees the spirit of 1 John underlying the Syrian rites and their order over against false gnostics.

[56] See *Gnostic Truth* ch. 2.

[57] 100-102.

[58] The implication is that chrism has a forward reference. Cf. the similar strategy and implication of 1 John 2:27: an appeal to the chrism (i.e. the gift of the Spirit) which all have, which remains and teaches and is true.

[59] Cf. John 20:22: Ignatius appears to have known Johannine traditions if not the written form. Could there also be an echo of 2 Cor. 2:14-16 here? Note that Ignatius does not make the obvious link of myrrh with the death of Christ; chrism is associated with immortality.

[60] A weakness in Winkler's hypothesis for the early Syrian order of chrism interpreted as signifying rebirth and the gift of the Spirit, and modelled on O.T. kingly/priestly anointing—all supposedly based on the baptism of Jesus—is the awkward fact that the Spirit descends *after* Jesus' baptism! Moreover, for one so insistent on observing linguistic distinctions, she fails to note the earlier careful differentiation between oil and myrrh.

[61] The similarities with Ignatius' language and treatment in *Eph.*, *Trall.* and *Smyrn.* over against the differences found in *Magn.* and *Philad.* would suggest (1) that his opponents in the first three were docetic Gnostics, (2) that the threat was real, not projected from Antioch, and would tend to support the claim Ignatius was fighting on two fronts.

[62] In British Library Oriental MS 9271. For the text see C. Schmidt, "Das koptische Didache-Fragment des British Museum" *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 24 (1925) 84 f.; L.-Th. Lefort, *Les pères apostoliques en copte* (CSCO 135 Scriptores Coptici 17) (Louvain 1952) 32; F. Stanley Jones & Paul A. Mirecki, "Considerations on the Coptic Papyrus of the Didache (British Library Oriental Manuscript 9271)" in C.N. Jefford ed., *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission* (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 77) (Leiden 1995) 52.

[63] 7,27.

[64] See M. Metzger, *Les constitutions apostoliques* 1 (Sources chrétiennes 320) (Paris 1985) 54-61.

[65] *Ibid.*

[66] Cf. *Didasc. apost.* 9 and 16; *Ap. Con.* 7,22, 44,1-3; 2,32,3; 3,16-17. On the evident problems see Metzger, *op. cit.* 94.

[67] "Uber einige Probleme der Didache-Uberlieferung" in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome/Freiburg/Vienna 1959) 156-167.

[68] "The So-Called Ointment Prayer in the Coptic Version of the Didache: A Re-evaluation," *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977), 67-84. His argument centres on *stinoufi* which he claims means incense, not myrrh, which the compiler of *Ap. Con.* misunderstood and converted to the myron prayer familiar to him. But, as suggested above

(n. 66), such a prayer and rite was new, causing him difficulty in explaining its rationale, since its link with the Spirit now applied to pre-baptismal chrism (cf. 3,17; 7,22,2; 2,32,3), and as we shall see, *stinoufi* can translate μύρον. In any case Gero's interpretation of 10 in terms of a meal is dubious and his explanation in terms of incense implausible: in what sense can incense be said to have been made known through Jesus? See K. Niederwimmer, "Textprobleme der Didache," *Wiener Studien* NF 16 (1982) 120 f.

[69] See "Textprobleme" *ibid.*, and *Die Didache* (Kommentar zür apostolischen Väter 1) (Göttingen 1995) 205-209. Cf. J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres* (Etudes Bibliques) (Paris 1958) 68; A Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache* (Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile 16) (Stockholm 1968) 53 f.

[70] "Textprobleme" 121 f.

[71] For the suggestion that earlier Egyptian initiation practice echoed or followed Syrian in having only pre-baptismal anointing cf. G. Kretschmar, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie, insbesondere der Taufliturgie, in Aegypten," *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 8 (1963) 43 ff.; Bradshaw, "Baptismal Practice in the Alexandrian Tradition, Eastern or Western?" in P. Bradshaw ed., *Essays in Early Eastern Initiation* (Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 8) (Nottingham 1988) 15 f.

[72] See *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 45 (1994) 309. However, Vööbus, *Traditions* 56, had already commented on the awkwardness of such a correlation. Hall does not commit himself on the genuineness of the prayer or what the *stinoufi* might represent.

[73] The reference to the "immortal aion" is an evident echo of the "immortality" of the latter. Notice his attempt to bolster Ignatius' apostolic credentials in 7,46,4: Ignatius appointed second bishop of Antioch by Paul. Cf. Ps. Ign. *Ant.* 7,1.

[74] See the suggestion of the latter by E.C. Ratcliff, "The Old Syrian Baptismal Tradition and its Resettlement under the Influence of Jerusalem in the Fourth Century," *Studies in Church History* 2 (1965) 19. Moreover the archaic Christology of the prayer ("Jesus your child (*shēri*/παῖς)") and subordination implied (the anointed is subordinate to the anointer) might also have proved attractive to the compiler. Its absence in John Chrysostom, writing in Antioch not long afterwards, can be explained by the justifiable assumption that the *Ap. Con.* compiler was a member of an Arian or non-Nicene community. Conversely, Chrysostom's use of μύρον as a mixture of oil and μύρον, the latter interpreted in terms of his overarching bridal symbolism (cf. *Cat. hom.* 2.22: Wenger SC 50 145, and *Cat. hom.* 3.27: A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia graeca sacra* (St. Petersburg 1909) 173/P.W. Harkins, *St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions* (ACW 31) (Westminster, Mlnd/London 1963) 169), might represent his appropriation of the developing use of μύρον in Antioch.

[75] On *stinoufi* as a combination of *stoei* + *noufe* and rendering of the εὐωδία of 2 Cor. 2:15, see Crum, *Dictionary* 362b s.v. *stoi.* In any case the compiler clearly understood the prayer to refer to μύρον, as is corroborated by the Ignatian allusion.

[76] "Probleme" 167.

[77] Cf. Dix, "Confirmation" 6.

[78] However the fact that in the following section (44,3) he does associate all the acts involving laying on of hands (i.e. pre-baptismal anointing, baptism, chrism) with an epiclesis "of this sort," might imply he considered the ointment prayer here to be such.

[79] *Ep.* 70,2.

[80] The omission of any reference to chrismation in the baptismal section of the *Didache*, an objection of Audet, *Didache* 68 n. 3, could be countered by suggesting that the likely imitation of Jesus' baptism (echoing Matt. 3:16 f.? Note the threefold formula of Matt. 28:19) and the anointing of his head with μύρον (in Matt. 26:7) underlying the rite and the prayer would suggest chrismation with μύρον after baptism, a simple act not needing to be spelt out, unlike the water baptism, for which the gospel account offers no guidance. Further, the chrismation might have taken place apart from the baptismal site, when the baptised joined the community for the eucharist, cf. *Canons of Hippolytus* 19.

[81] *Ad Autol.* 1,12. His analogies suggest a more Hellenistic view of oil for all-over cleansing and may attest indirectly the transition to the cathartic/exorcistic view of the later Syrian tradition. Cf. *Acts of Thomas* 25-7; 121; 132; 157; Ps. Clem. *Rec.* 3,67,4 etc.

[82] For evidence of Western use of myrrh (or a mixture of oil and myrrh) after baptism, cf. Hipp. *Comm. in Dan.* 1,16,3; Tert. *De bapt.* 7 (but the reference is to oil, not myrrh or a myrrh-oil mixture).

[83] Cf. the continual stress in *Act. Thom.* (e.g. 25; 27; 120; 132; 157) on Jesus' Messiahship in the context of initiation, but with almost no allusion to his baptism. For Christ as first anointed by the Father with oil from the tree of life and thus called "Christ," cf. Ps. Clem. *Rec.* 1,45; for the episcopal chrismating of baptisands on the head as O.T. priests were anointed, to make them Christians from Christ, with holy oil as a type of spiritual baptism (i.e. the original chrismation of Christ) cf. *Ap. Con.* 3,16,3-4. It is only later Syrian commentators (e.g. John Chrysostom, *Cat. hom.* 3,13: Papadopoulos-Kerameus/Harkins ACW 164) who see our initiation as modelled on Jesus' baptism, while Cyril of Jerusalem (*Myst. cat.* 3,2) buttresses his support for post-baptismal chrismation with myrrh by identifying Jesus' chrismation with the descent of the Spirit ("intelligible 'oil of gladness'") after his baptism.

[84] Cf. Brock, "Transition" 216, 220-223; Cyr. Jer. *Myst. cat.* 3,1 f.; *Ap. Con.* 3,16,2-4; Theod. Mops. *Cat. hom.* 14,27 (R. Tonneau & R. Devresse, *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e Testi 149) (Vatican City 1949) 457/A. Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies* 6 (Cambridge 1933) 68 f.). For a similar development in Egypt cf. *Can. Hipp.* 19; Sarapion, *Sacr.* 15 and 16.

[85] Cf. her "From Alexandria to Rome: The Valentinian Connection to the Incorporation of Exorcism as a Pre-baptismal Rite," *Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (1990) 6-24.

[86] *Myst. cat.* 3,1 ff.

[87] Chrysostom is aware of the term μύρον (see n. 74 above) but applies it to the pre-baptismal anointing, while the reference in Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Cat. hom.* 14,27), has been disputed. See Bradshaw, *Search* 122.

[88] *Pan.* 40,2,6-8. Note that the Cainites, a sect of my Gnostics (cf. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1,31,1) attacked by Tertullian (*De bapt.* 1,2), also rejected water baptism. Cf. *Apoc. Adam* 84,4-85,18.

[89] Cf. *Pan.* 40,2,9-3,6: note the reference to μυρεψικὸν ἔλαιον, the gloss of μύρον as balsam or nard and the order bath (λουτρόν) and perfume (εὐοδμία), suggesting the Cyrilline order and ingredient: baptism followed by chrismation with μύρον.

[90] The similarity with Irenaeus' Valentinians and Celsus' and Origen's Ophites suggests the kind of rite sketched above: baptism into the Gnostic triad ("Mother and Father of the all . . .") followed by chrismation involving seals as talismans against the archons.

[91] 40,1,3-6. He had been deposed and banished by bishop Aetius (of Lydda?), and on return was finally unmasked by Epiphanius himself.
[92] Cf. *Myst. cat.* 3,3 f.

University of Exeter
Department of Theology
Exeter EX4 4QH

A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF POLYCARP *PHILIPPIANS* 11.3

BY

MICHAEL W. HOLMES

By common consent one of the most difficult clauses in Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians*[1] occurs in 11.3, which reads (in part) as follows:

> (a) But I have not observed or heard of any such thing among you, (b) in whose midst the blessed Paul labored, (c) *qui estis in principio epistulae eius*, (d) for he boasts about you in all the churches . . .

The problem is in clause (c), the phrase *qui estis in principio epistulae eius* (perhaps "who are in the beginning of his letter"); something appears to have been lost or garbled either in translation or transmission.[2] A number of attempts have been made either to interpret the phrase as it stands or to rectify it via emendation; in the following list the first two construe the phrase as it has been transmitted, while the rest propose emendations of one sort or another.[3]

1) "who in the beginning (*of the Gospel*) were his letters (*of commendation*)."[4]
2) "who are *mentioned* in the beginning of his epistle."[5]
3) "who were *praised* [*laudati*] in the beginning of his letter."[6]
4) "who are in the beginning his *church*," *qui estis in principio ecclesia eius*.[7]
5) "who were in the beginning of the *gospel*."[8]
6) "who were in the beginning of his *apostolate*."[9]

The following emendation understands Paul, rather than the Philippians, as the antecedent of the clause:

7) "who *testifies* in the beginning of his letter."[10]

In assessing these various proposals, it may be granted that Volkmar's proposal (#7) is ingenious, but perhaps overly complex; moreover, it appears that Paul does not become the focus of Polycarp's attention until clause (d), and that Polycarp usually supplies the object of his verbs (cf. the following "boasts about you").[11] Against #1 (and, to a lesser extent, #2) is the observation that it is unlike Polycarp either to leave verbs unexpressed or to require his readers to infer so much of his train of thought.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 207-210

Proposals 4, 5, and 6 share a conviction that the problem lies in the noun at the end of the phrase, but each results in a clause that is somewhat awkward with respect to syntax and somewhat obscure with respect to content—hardly characteristics of a compelling emendation.[12]

A less problematic solution is possible if one locates the problem in the verb (or absence thereof) near the beginning of the phrase, as does #3 above (cf. also #2).[13] Indeed, as its widespread popularity attests, there is much to commend Smith's emendation—it reads very smoothly, it creates no new interpretive difficulties (unlike proposals #4, #5, and #6), and it fits the flow of Polycarp's thought very nicely—particularly if one is of the opinion that the error occurred on the level of the transmission of the Latin text.

But it may be that the problem occurred at an earlier stage, either during the transmission of the Greek text or in the translation process.[14] Thus it may be proposed that Polycarp originally wrote something like the following:

> τοῖς[15] ἐπαινουμένοις[16] ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτοῦ
>
> (the ones) who are praised in the beginning of his letter.

On this view the problem will have arisen when the eye of a copyist or translator skipped from τοῖς to the end of ἐπαινουμένοις, unintentionally omitting the participle due to homoeoteleuton (. . .τΟΙΣΕΠΑινουμενΟΙΣΕΝΑρχηι . . .). The similarity of the following letters (i.e., ΕΠΑ, ΕΝΑ) would have made this common slip even easier to commit.

Regardless of the merits (or lack thereof) of the proposed emendation, if it does not in fact represent what Polycarp wrote, it may be suggested that it at least indicates the direction of his thought in this problematic portion of his letter.

NOTES

[1] For text, translation, and introduction, see J.B. Lightfoot and J.R. Harmer, eds., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings*, 2nd ed. revised and edited by Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids, 1992) 202-221.

[2] "The translation is very loose at times, and the Greek text from which it was made was not free from errors. Moreover the text of the version itself has not been transmitted to us uncorrupted" (J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part 2: *S. Ignatius. S. Polycarp* [3 vols.; London, 1885, [2]1889; reprint Grand Rapids, 1981] 1.551).

[3] See further Theodor Zahn, Zur Biographie des Polykarpus und des Irenäus, in Johannes Hausleiter und Theodor Zahn, eds., *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen*

Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur 4 (Erlangen and Leipzig, 1891) 252, n. 1; William R. Schoedel, *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias* (AFNTC 5; Camden, NJ, 1967) 32-34.

[4] Thus Nolte, according to and followed by Lightfoot (the quotation is from *Apostolic Fathers* 2.3.342-343, with the italics reversed), reading the text in light of Phil. 4:15 ("in the beginning of the gospel") and 2 Cor. 3:2 ("you are our letter"), construing *epistulae* as a nominative plural, and taking the present tense *estis* as a mistranslation of a temporally ambiguous participle (perhaps οὖσιν, "being"). Cf. also Francis X. Glimm, The Letter of St. Polycarp to the Philippians, in Francis X. Glimm, Joseph M.-F. Marique, and Gerald G. Walsh, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Fathers of the Church; New York, 1947) 142. Schoedel (*Polycarp*, 32-33) thinks this reading is unlikely in view of the singular "letter" in 2 Cor. 3:2, but the transformation of a singular into a plural under the influence of the plural "you" reflects just the kind of adaptation found elsewhere in Polycarp's use of written documents.

[5] So James A. Kleist (*The Didache, The Epistle of Barnabas, The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, The Fragments of Papias, The Epistle to Diognetus* [ACW 6; Westminster, MD, and London, 1948] 81, emphasis added), reading *epistulae* as a genitive singular and assuming an implied verb; similarly Schoedel (*Polycarp*, 32-34; it is to be regretted that in the midst of offering cogent assessments of earlier suggestions, Schoedel says almost nothing on behalf of his own rendering).

[6] The emendation is attributed to Thomas Smith (*S. Ignatii Epistolae Genuinae juxta exemplar Medecéum denuo recensitae, una cum Veteri Latina Versione: annotationibus D. Joannis Pearsoni Nuber episcopi Cestriensis, et Thomae Smith S.T.P. illustratae. . . . Accedunt Acta genuina Martyri S. Ignatii, Epistola S. Polycarpi ad Philippenses*, etc. [Oxford, 1709]), a book not available to me; Walter Bauer (*Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief* [HNT; Die Apostolischen Väter 2; Tübingen, 1920] 295) describes Smith's contribution as an appendix to an edition annotated by John Pearson. Smith interpreted the resulting text in light of Phil. 1:3-11. It has been widely adopted, sometimes in conjunction with a different or supplemental explanation (some of which appear to be driven more by hypotheses about 2 Thessalonians than the text of 11.3); see, e.g., Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 295; Henning Paulsen, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Brief des Polykarp von Smyrna.* Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage der Auslegung von Walter Bauer (HNT 18: Die Apostolischen Väter 2; Tübingen, 1985) 124; A. von Harnack, *Patristische Miscellen* (TU 20.3; Leipzig, 1899) 92; A. Lindemann, Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers, in W.S. Babcock, ed., *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (Dallas, 1990) 42 with 327, n. 43; *idem, Paulus im ältesten Christentum* (BHTh 58; Tübingen, 1979) 90; E. Schweizer, Der zweite Thessalonicherbrief ein Philipperbrief?, *ThZ* 1 (1945) 90-105.

[7] So Adolf Hilgenfeld (*Ignatii Antiocheni et Polycarpi Smyrnaei Epistulae et Martyria* [Berlin, 1902] 326), construing the phrase in light of Phil. 4:15 and reading *ecclesia* for *epistulae*, an adaptation of the reading of codex Reginensis (r), *ecclesiae*; he suggests that the Greek read οἵτινές ἐστε ἡ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐκκλησία αὐτοῦ. The awkwardness, however, of the present tense (the preceding "labored" favors a past tense) argues strongly against this suggestion.

[8] I.e., reading *evangelii* for *epistulae*; so G. Krüger (Briefe des Ignatius und Polykarp, in E. Hennecke, ed., *Handbuch zu den Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* [Tübingen, 1904] 203), in light of *1 Clem.* 47.2 ("What did he first write to you in the beginning of the gospel?") and Phil. 4:15.

[9] I.e., reading in Greek ἀποστολῆς for ἐπιστολῆς; so Zahn (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament* [2 vols.; Leipzig, ³1906, 1907] 1.381; *Introduction to the New Testament* [3 vols.; New York, 1909] 1.536), who credits E. Nestle for the suggestion that as in Acts 21:25, 1 Kgs (LXX 3 Kgdms) 5:8, and Neh. 6:19 (LXX 2 Esdr. 16:19) the verbs ἀποστέλλειν ("to send") and ἐπιστέλλειν ("to inform" or "to write") have been confused, so here the translator mistakenly read ἐπιστολῆς ("letter") for ἀποστολῆς ("mission" or "apostolate," as in Gal. 2:8). The point is diminished, however, in that in all three instances the confusion is between aorist forms of the two verbs (απεστ- versus επεστ-) and consequently involves the interchange of only a single letter, whereas here the proposal envisions the interchange not only of α/ε but also ο/ι (αποστ- versus επιστ-).

[10] So Volkmar (as quoted by Hilgenfeld, *Polycarpi Smyrnaei*, 326-327), who locates the corruption in the transmission of the Latin text: the omission of a T from QUIESTTESTIS (i.e., *qui est testis*, "who testifies," a translation, Volkmar suggests, of ὃς μαρτυρεῖ) resulted in QUIESTESTIS; an attempt to make sense of it led to the removal of the apparently redundent *est*, producing *qui estis*.

[11] It must be granted, however, that the Latin is less than careful in its treatment of pronouns (e.g., in 1.1 the second ὑμῖν, "to you," disappears).

[12] As Bruce M. Metzger notes, "an emendation that introduces fresh difficulties stands self-condemned" (*The Text of the New Testament* [New York and Oxford, ³1992] 185, n. 1).

[13] Harnack (*Miscellen*, 92) suggests that the *etenim* of the Latin translation represents καὶ γάρ, "for indeed," and not simply γάρ, "for," and that the following clause, "he boasts about you in all the churches," is epexegetic of the preceding one. If so, this would strengthen the case for thinking that the problem is a missing verb.

[14] Cf. Zahn's suggestion (#6 above). Those who may insist that the error occurred on the level of the Latin text are invited to view the following suggestion as a proposed retroversion.

[15] Following Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2.3.342), who supplies it as the first word of his Greek retroversion of the phrase in question.

[16] Harnack (*Miscellen*, 92) suggests that the Greek read οἵτινες αἰνεῖσθε, "who are praised," which he thinks might easily have been misread as οἵτινές ἐστε, "who are." This suggestion is unlikely, however, inasmuch as elsewhere in early Christian literature αἰνεῖν ("to praise") is used only with God as its object (cf. BAGD, *s.v.* αἰνέω; H. Balz, "αἰνέω, etc.," *EDNT* 1 [1990] 39-40). Ἐπαινεῖν ("to praise" or "to approve of"), on the other hand, which can have God as its object (e.g., Rom. 15:11), is used more often of humans (e.g., Luke 16:8, 1 Cor. 11:2; for the passive participle, see *Barn.* 11.9).

Dept. of Biblical and Theological Studies
Bethel College, *St. Paul*, MN U.S.A.

REVIEWS

Augustine, *De doctrina christiana.* Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Notes by R.P.H. Green. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995. xxvi, 293 p.

Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? Tertullian's provocative exclamation in *De praescriptione haereticorum* 7.9 set the tone for a long and painstaking discussion among western Christians. What was the value of pagan cultural accomplishments in comparison with the salutary truth of God's own Word? In spite of their continual use of these accomplishments, even prominent thinkers like Lactantius and Jerome failed to contrive a satisfactory answer. This only became available when the brightest mind of late antiquity analyzed the problem: Greeks and Romans extracted their riches *de quibusdam quasi metallis divinae providentiae, quae ubique infusa est.* Thus Augustine in a confident phrase near the end of book 2 of his *De doctrina christiana.* It expresses the invincible trust he put in the goodness of God's creation, which man can abuse but not destroy. In this way Scripture was no longer merely contrasted with objectionable pagan traditions but placed within the traditional horizon, indeed at its very centre. Whoever wanted to understand the difficulties and hidden truths of the Bible, was in need of a thorough and broad "paideia," or, to use the Latin term, *doctrina*, mirroring all that God had created.

De doctrina christiana is therefore perhaps the clearest expression of what has been styled Augustine's "secularizing" or "functionalizing" of pagan culture. Its importance can hardly be overrated, both as a prominent testimony of Augustine's own thought and where its seminal influence on the further development of a christian use of Graeco-Roman culture and literature is concerned. It has not suffered from neglect by the scholarly world; there are two modern editions: J. Martin in CCSL XXXII (Turnhout 1962) and W.M. Green in CSEL LXXX (Vienna 1963); some translations worth to be mentioned have been published by G. Combès and M. Farges in BA 11 (Paris 1949), D.W. Robertson (Indianapolis 1958), L. Alici (Milan 1989). R.P.H. Green, whose large edition with commentary of Ausonius (Oxford 1991) has met with merited praise, now presents a bilingual English edition, in which the Latin text is essentially based on the "textus receptus." However, this does not entail a passive conservatism: G. has taken due

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

note of the textual proposals made by C. Schäublin (persistently spelt Schaüblin here) in *Wiener Studien* N.F. 8 (1974) 173-181 and, moreover, added his personal emendations. Some examples: in 1.17 *eam vita vivere vel non vivere* G. changes *vita* into *vel.* The attractive part of this is the suppression of *vita*, which is less likely at this point of the argument; it seems best to regard it as an interpolation and to omit it without any substitution; in 2.37 G. follows Schäublin in introducing a much needed *cum* before *unus interpres*; in 3.42 he rightly prefers *temperans* to *intemperans; singula* (3.80) is a convincing emendation of *singulae*; he makes a good case for *volentibus* instead of *nolentibus* in 4.63: people who "want" to read a book are not necessarily annoyed when they fail to understand a point; in 4.97 G. agrees with Schäublin's proposal to introduce *in nostris* before *hoc est*, which is at least a reasonable solution of a textual problem; athetizing *grandi genere* in 4.150 is a wise measure; it is a classic example of a gloss. On the other hand, I am less sure of *minori* (2.25), which, in fact, rather seems an error of the press, *suae cuique* (2.100) for *sua cuique, suus* for *suos* (4.72). These are, however, trivialities. G. undoubtedly provides the reader with an intelligible text.

As to the translation, the first problem concerns the title. Robertson's "On Christian Doctrine" is out of the question. Kevane called the book "a treatise on Christian education" (*Recherches Augustiniennes* IV (1966) 97-133), taking *doctrina* to be the equivalent of "paideia." G. firmly chooses "Christian teaching" and calls the book "a guide to the discovery and communication of what is taught in the Bible," not solely for the clergy, but for all those who felt the need for such instruction. So from this elucidation it can be gathered that according to him Augustine aims at "teaching" Christians with some degree of responsibility in the christian community. Yet the contents of Augustine's book are quite ambitious; he wants to use the whole of pagan learning in the right and proper way. Possibly, Marrou's predilection for "culture, au sens perfectif du mot" is too bold a maximization, but "education" deserves closer attention, especially since this term denotes both the process of learning and the accomplishments resulting from it.

Generally speaking, G.'s translation is reliable and helpful. Here and there an interpretation is slightly liable to questioning. A few instances may be mentioned here. A minor point occurs in Praef. 18. Augustine argues that a person who knows to read does not require another person a *quo audiat quid ibi scriptum sit*; G. renders with ". . . to explain . . ."; this should rather be ". . . to tell him . . ."; in 1.62 the argument is that one should

love all people but take thought of those who are in close contact with one. When two people are in need of something which can only be provided to one of them, one decides *sorte*, "by lot." Analogously, since a person cannot take thought of all men, he settles *pro sorte*, according to the closeness of their association with him; *pro sorte* does not mean "by lot," but "instead of lot" closer relationship is now the decisive factor; 2.125 *infertur vera conexione quod falsum est* does not mean "a false proposition is introduced," but "falsehood is inferred": *inferre* is a logical t.t. (see TLL VII 1.1382.84 *sqq.; doctr.* 2.125 occurs in the list of instances given); *numerositas clausularum* (4.147) denotes the "rhythm of clausulae" rather than their "extensive use"; moreover, *clausularum* presumably is a genitivus inversus. Some admirable phrases deserve to be mentioned too: 1.49 men do not hate their body, they want it to be *incorreptum et celerrimum*, "free from corruption and totally responsive," 2.72 *in litteris sacris*, "in pagan literature" (in 4.28, however, the same phrase denotes Scripture!); 4.28 *non magnitudine sed tumore*, "on the basis not of grandeur but grandiloquence."

Dr. Green has rendered a praiseworthy service to those who are interested in Augustine's assessment of pagan culture and learning.

Commanderijpoort 4-6, 2311 WB Leiden J. Den Boeft

John Oommen Madathil, *Kosmas der Indienfahrer. Kaufmann, Kosmologe und Exeget zwischen alexandrinischer und antiochenischer Theologie* (Frühes Christentum, Forschungen und Perspektiven 4). Thaur, 1996. 213 S. Pr. DM 34,80/öS 248,—.

Der Verfasser hat sich zum Ziel gesetzt, den Standort des Kosmas Indikopleustes als Theologe näher zu bestimmen. Namentlich unbekannt, verdankt Kosmas den Namen, unter dem wir ihn kennen, seinen kosmologischen Auseinandersetzungen. Er war ein weitgereister ägyptischer Kaufmann aus der ersten Hälfte des 6. Jh., der später Mönch wurde und aufgrund seiner Reisen und auf der Grundlage der Schrift eine "christliche Topographie," die erste in ihrer Art, verfasste. Darin finden sich unter anderem interessante Berichte über die Ausbreitung des Christentums in Indien und Persien.

Anhand vieler Stellen in Kosmas' Werk kann Madathil sich völlig mit der von J. Crindle und E. Winstedt vertretenen Meinung abfinden, dass Kosmas in seiner Exegese namentlich antiochenisch orientiert ist und der

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

buchstäblichen, historischen und typologischen Methode der Exegese folgt, wie sie in der antiochenischen Schule gehandhabt wurde. Obwohl Kosmas aus Ägypten gebürtig war, weist sein Werk kaum Spuren der Erklärungsweise der alexandrinischen Schule auf, welche die allegorische Interpretation bevorzugte. Es finden sich bei ihm nur wenige allegorische Erklärungen. Sein Weltbild ist ganz von der Bibel bestimmt und er verwirft die Theorie des Ptolemäus, die Welt habe eine Kugelgestalt. Kosmas nimmt die Schöpfungsgeschichte wörtlich und betrachtet den Aufbau des Bundeszeltes (mit Berufung auf *Hebr.* 9,12) als Modell für den Aufbau der Welt.

Madathil hat sorgfältig die exegetische Methode und die Christologie des Kosmas untersucht. Es hat sich daraus ergeben, dass sich in Kosmas' christologischen Ausführungen keine Spuren von Nestorianismus finden und dass seine Auffassungen mit der Tradition der Kirche übereinstimmen. Das Ergebnis, dass Kosmas der antiochenischen Schule am nächsten steht, ist allerdings nicht überraschend.

Leider haften dieser interessanten Studie auch gewisse Unvollkommenheiten an. Nicht nur sind die Druckfehler zahlreich, sondern auch die Schreibweise der Eigennamen ist nicht immer uniform. Wir finden Kyrus (S. 27) neben Kyrrhus (S. 157), Chrysostomos (S. 104 und 105) neben Chrysostomus (S. 159 und 160), Cyrill (S. 54) neben Kyrill (S. 138), weiter neben Apollinaristen (S. 11) die unrichtige Form Apolinaristen (S. 145 et alibi). Pamphilus, dem Kosmas seine Arbeit gewidmet hat, wird mehrmals als Pamphilius bezeichnet. S. 103 werden Willace und Hadrill erwähnt; es handelt sich jedoch um eine einzelne Person (Wallace-Hadrill; mehrere Stellen sind zu korrigieren). S. 90[57] lese man *quos proprie* statt *quios properi.*

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. Bartelink

Derek Krueger, *Symeon the Holy Fool. Leontius' Life and the Late Antique City* (Transformation of the Classical Heritage 25). University of California Press, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1996. 196 S. Pr. $35,—.

In dieser Studie wird das Phänomen des "Narren um Christi Willen" in klarer Weise behandelt, sowohl die Vorgeschichte der *Vita* des Symeon als das Echo in byzantinischer Zeit. Krueger hat wichtige Aspekte wie die *imitatio Christi* gut ausgearbeitet. Dass jedoch der Kyniker Diogenes von Sinope ein unmittelbares Beispiel für mehrere Szenen in der *Vita* sei, scheint mir nicht bewiesen zu sein. Auch der Herausgeber des griechischen Textes

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

von Symeons Leben, Rydén, urteilt: "Dass wir hier einem ungriechischen Asketentyp begegnen, der trotz gewisser äusserer Ähnlichkeiten mit den Kynikern nichts zu tun hat, scheint deutlich." (S. 17-19). Im Lichte der spärlichen Zeugnisse gehen mehrere von Kruegers Ausführungen zu weit, wie: "The Cynic way of life continued to have a powerful appeal in the fifth century" (S. 78) und "Nevertheless, after the 'army of the dogs' had ceased to attract recruits, it was rhetorical education which guaranteed familiarity with Diogenes into the seventh century and beyond" (S. 78). Schwerlich lässt sich behaupten, dass in den Schulen von einem "extensive use of Diogenes *chreiai* in grammatical and rhetorical exercises" (S. 92) die Rede gewesen sei. Es gibt keinen Anlass anzunehmen, dass die Schüler mehr als einige vereinzelte Anekdoten gehört hätten oder dass Diogenes' Name ausserhalb einer grösserer Reihe von Philosophen gefallen wäre.

Krueger hat seiner Arbeit eine Übersetzung der *Vita* hinzugefügt, die erste in englischer Sprache. Die Hinweise auf Bibelanspielungen sind bisweilen etwas spärlich ausgefallen. So würde man bei "the straight and narrow path" (S. 132) einen Hinweis auf *Matth.* 7,14 erwarten. Etwas weiter (im griechischen Text πάντοτε ... περιφέροντες) wäre ein Hinweis auf 2 *Cor.* 4,10 angebracht gewesen. Im Gebet des Nikon (S. 142) findet Krueger eine Reminiszenz an die Worte des Moses beim brennenden Dornbusch (*Exod.* 3,2), aber es handelt sich hier vielmehr um eine Erinnerung an *Is.* 6. Nicht nur die Erwähnung eines Propheten, sondern auch jene der "unreinen Lippen" und die Anrufung "Gott der himmlischen Mächte" weisen darauf hin. Krueger übersetzt ἐπάκουσόν μου ἐν πυρὶ προσευχῆς: "hear my prayer from within the fire" (richtig: "hear me in my fervent prayer" or "hear my fervent prayer").

Während die Übersetzung des zweiten Teils (Auftreten Symeons als Narr um Christi Willen) durchaus genau und sorgfältig ist, sind im ersten Teil einige Versehen zu verzeichnen. So ist die Übersetzung von Οἱ τὸ διδασκαλικὸν πρὸς ἀλλήλους σπεύδοντες μεταδιώκειν ἀξίωμα ("Those who are eager to pursue the worthy status which can be taught to others," S. 131) zu korrigieren: "... the worthy status to teach one the others." Weiter wird ἢ πόθῳ τῶν μελλόντων τῶν παρόντων ὡς παρερχομένων καταφρονῆσαι übersetzt: "either to despise the desire for things which come in the present because they pass away" (S. 132). Objekt von καταφρονῆσαι ist jedoch τῶν παρόντων: "either, for the sake of the desire for the future things, to despise the present things because they pass away." Etwas weiter wird τῆς ἡμετέρας καὶ αὐτοὶ φύσεως ὑπάρχοντες übersetzt: "and they themselves master our nature" (S. 132). Leontius meint jedoch: die Menschen,

welche Gott gefallen und uns zum Vorbild sind, sind Menschen wie wir ("they themselves possess our nature"). In der folgenden Stelle hat διά eine lokale und nicht eine kausale Bedeutung: ὥστε διὰ τῶν δοκούντων τοῖς ἐμπαθεστέροις καὶ σαρκωδεστέροις μολυσμὸν καὶ βλάβην καὶ ἐμπόδιον τοῦ πρὸς ἀρετὴν βίου προσγίνεσθαι, διὰ τούτων οὗτος ὁ καθαρώτατος ὥσπερ μαργαρίτης διὰ βορβόρου ἀμολύντως διώδευσεν. Krueger (S. 132-133): "although to those more impassioned and more fleshly he seemed to be a defilement, a sort of poison, and an impediment to the virtuous life on account of his appearance. Because of these things he was most pure, just as a pearl which has traveled through slime unsullied." Richtiger wäre: "so that, although what to those more impassioned and more fleshly seems to come as a defilement, a damage and an impediment to the virtuous life, the most pure man went unsullied through these things, just as a pearl through slime." S. 133 ist τῆς λοιπῆς τοῦ βίου ἀπάτης ("the rest of the deception of his life") wohl eine Parallele zu ἀπάτη τῶν κοσμικῶν ("the delusion of worldly things," S. 149). βίος ist hier das irdische Leben. Man könnte also übersetzen: "the rest of the delusion of this life." Krueger übersetzt ὅταν ἀπάσης τῆς τοῦ βίου τρυφῆς καὶ δόξης ὡς ἀράχνης περιέπτυσεν mit "because he spat upon all the softness and sentiment of life as on a spider" (S. 133). Zu bevorzugen ist: ". . . upon all the luxury and glory of life as on a spider's web." Ἐκαθέζοντο οὖν καὶ οἱ δύο ἵππους (Krueger, S. 134: "However the two remounted their horses") wäre etwa zu übersetzen: "Now the two were mounted on horses"). Es handelt sich hier um die Beschreibung der plötzlichen radikalen Bekehrung des Sophronius und Symeon, wobei mit dieser Bemerkung betont wird, dass beide einer begüterten Familie angehörten. Sie entäussern sich ihres Besitzes, überlassen die Pferde ihren Dienern und entfernen sich heimlich.

Krueger übersetzt weiter den Anfang eines Gebetes: "do not remember my constant disobediences with contempt" (S. 142: μὴ μνημονεύων . . . τῶν ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς ἀεὶ παρακοῶν τῆς ἐμῆς ἐξουδενώσεως). Die letzten Worte sind typisch byzantinisch: eine abstrakte Umschreibung einer Person ("meiner Nichtswürdigkeit").

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. Bartelink

Helga Botermann, *Das Judenedikt des Kaisers Claudius. Römischer Staat und* Christiani *im 1. Jahrhundert*, Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart, 1996 (Hermes Einzelschriften, 71), 200 p.

The emperor Claudius' measures against the Jews in Rome have been discussed time and again by historians, philologists and theologians, but seldom as exhaustively as in the first part of Botermann's recently published *Judenedikt* (chapters II, III and IV; chapter I is an introductory essay on the aims of the study). The author, very well at home in both the theological and the historical scholarly literature on the subject, firmly formulates her own answers to the many difficult questions arising from the sources (Suet. *Cl.* 25.4: *Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit, Act.Ap.* 18.2, D.C. 60.6.6 and Oros. 7.6.15 in the first place), but she also evaluates at length other possible (and impossible) interpretations. Her central thesis is that Claudius' edict (or rather edicts) contains the reaction of the Roman authorities to the unrest caused, not by Jews in general, but by a heretical Jewish sect, the early Christians ("Das Claudiusedikt ist also das früheste Echo der christlichen Mission, das wir in einer nicht-christlichen Quelle greifen können, was fast alle Altertumswissenschaftler—Philologen wie Historiker—seit Jahrhunderten bestreiten," p. 7). Arguing that Claudius' edict was merely one episode in the process which caused Jews and Christians slowly but surely to drift apart, Botermann in the second part of her book sketches the general political context into which the emperor's measures have to be fitted (chapter V).

The book is lucidly written and offers a coherent interpretation of an interesting but complex set of problems. It would be an illusion, however, to think that the final answer has now been given to all the questions relating to Claudius' measures. There remain, even if one accepts the main argument (which I for my part am willing to do), enough moot points. The authenticity of the edict of Claudius to the Alexandrians quoted by Josephus (*AJ* 19.278-285), for instance, rejected by Botermann (pp. 106 ff.), or the role of Peter in Rome during the forties and fifties A.D., which was, according to the author, very important (but she admits, fairly enough, "es handelt sich freilich nur um eine Hypothese," p. 140). Nevertheless, with its well-reasoned argument Botermann's *Judenedikt* merits attention of all those interested in the history of the first century of the Christian era.

3063 VE *Rotterdam*, Drinkwaterweg 571 H.C. TEITLER

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Beat Näf, *Senatorisches Standesbewusstsein in spätrömischer Zeit*, Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, 1995 (Paradosis. Beiträge zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur und Theologie, 40). Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, 1995. X, 348 p.

Analyzing the self-consciousness of the senatorial aristocracy of the later Roman empire, Beat Näf distances himself from some commonly held negative judgements regarding the mentality of the *ordo amplissimus*. To reproach senators of egoism, materialism, corruption or decadence is not, he argues, helpful to reach a better understanding of their mentality and it obstructs the view on their participation in the administration of the empire. As to the latter aspect, the central thesis defended by Näf is that holding offices remained till the last period of the empire an honour of prime importance in senatorial self-consciousness. Far from abandoning a time-honoured political system most senators strove to uphold its official values. In this respect Christianity did not bring about a fundamental change, although after their conversion many authors who belonged to the senatorial aristocracy (more, in fact, than is commonly assumed) cut the ties which linked them to their order and gave up their aspirations to play a role in public life.

After an introduction (pp. 1-11), in which the aims of the book are sketched and some problems of conceptualizing and terminological questions discussed ("senatorisches Standesbewusstsein [ist] wesentlich Adelsbewusstsein"), the first two chapters (pp. 12-48) are devoted to a discussion of the formal constitution of the senatorial order and of its means of representation by way of statues, inscriptions, diptychs, mosaics, rhetoric, epistolography and the like. Then follows the main part of the book (pp. 49-275), concerned with senatorial self-consciousness as expressed by various authors, neatly arranged in chronological order and taking geographical differences into consideration. Chapter III deals with fourth and fifth century pagan authors originating in the West ("Standesbewusstsein bei profanen westlichen Autoren"; but among them are also the *miles quondam et Graecus* Ammianus Marcellinus and the poet Claudian of Alexandria). In chapter IV we meet Augustine, Paulinus of Nola, Ambrose, Jerome and some of their christian contemporaries. Chapter V ("Senatorisches Standesbewusstsein in Gallien im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert") is the longest of them all (pp. 117-192), with, of course, a dominating role for Sidonius Apollinaris—Jill Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the fall of Rome, A.D. 407-485* (Oxford 1994), apparently came too late to be included into the rich documenta-

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

tion Näf appended to his book. Näf also deals with fifth and sixth century Italy (ch. VI), Africa, Spain and Noricum (ch. VII) and, in a disproportionally and disappointingly short chapter (VIII, pp. 246-275), the eastern half of the empire. Näf's book ends with concluding observations (IX), an annotated catalogue of modern literature, lists of ancient and modern sources and an index.

Senatorisches Standesbewusstein is a very readable book. It provides a rich survey of the ways in which the late Roman senatorial aristocracy (mainly in the western half of the empire) viewed its position in a changing and ever more christianizing world. Needless to say this aristocracy was not a monolithic section of the population. Many differences existed among its members, in wealth, descent, political power and so on. The author is fully aware of this. However, his main concern is not so much with this variety as with the things the aristocrats had in common. On this he has much to say (but perhaps the attitudes to public office of the aristocracy were more ambivalent than Näf wants us to believe) and the thoroughness which characterizes Näf's study guarantees its usefulness as a reference book for many years to come.

I noted a few minor flaws. For example, on p. 280, speaking of the aristocratical habit of claiming descent of republican or even mythical ancestors, Näf correctly states that mistrust of such fanciful genealogies can also be found in our sources. However, he should have quoted Gregory of Nazianzus (*or.* 25.3) instead of Gregory of Nyssa and he should have left out Amm. 28.1.30. Ammianus writes: *Opportunum est, ut arbitror, explanare nunc causam, quae ad exitium praecipitem Aginatium impulit, iam inde a priscis maioribus nobilem, ut locuta est pertinacior fama; nec enim super hoc ulla documentorum rata est fides.* It is not doubt in Aginatius' noble descent that is expressed here, as becomes obvious when one adduces for comparison 28.1.52 and 28.1.54. Aginatius is called there, without further qualification, *homo patriciae stirpis* and *senator(em) perspicui generis* (in 28.1.30 *ut locuta est pertinacior fama* is to be connected to *explanare nunc causam*, as was rightly seen by e.g. G. Sabbah, *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin. Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae*, Paris 1978, 134-135 and P. van de Wiel, *Hoofdstukken uit de geschiedenis van Rome in Ammianus Marcellinus Res Gestae*, Diss. Amsterdam 1989, 159-160).

3063 VE *Rotterdam*, Drinkwaterweg 571 H.C. TEITLER

Wolfgang Kemp, *Christliche Kunst: ihre Anfänge, ihre Strukturen.* München, Schirmer/Mosel, 1994. 307 p., 16 plates, 71 illustrations. DM 98.— ISBN 3-88814-737-9.

In this book Wolfgang Kemp studies—as he did already in earlier publications—what he calls "Bildsysteme."[1] He starts with the presupposition that Christian art—at least art before circa 1400—presents pictures that are never isolated, but always combined with other pictures. These pictures are in some way connected. Titles from his earlier publications show that he discusses narrativity in this context.[2]

In his *Christliche Kunst* the author has selected a certain number of works of art dating from the fourth and fifth century, which he studies exemplarily: illuminated manuscripts, mosaics, ivories and reliefs in wood. They all are works of art that show more than one representation. These representations are selected and ordered in a certain fashion. Kemp is looking for the leading principles behind this selective ordering. According to him, the principles at work in these early examples are also applicable to the later, mediaeval art unto 1400.

The first three chapters are introductory. In the actual Introduction, which precedes these chapters (pp. 9-20), we read that only since the nineteenth century the question "what is the essence of Christian (in fact Early Christian and mediaeval) art?," became a real issue. In those days the prevailing view was that Christian art is "spriritual" and idealistic, whereas the realistic Greco-Roman art is concerned with sensual beauty. Such statements are no longer satisfactory. Questioning the true nature of Christian art has become obscure. As far as Early Christian art is concerned, this art is nowadays considered to be part of the field of classical archaeology or art history. According to André Grabar, Early Christian art does not have a typical vocabulary or syntax.

Kemp does not completely agree: according to him Early Christian art does have a distinguishing syntax. He states that there are no isolated images until 1400: "Die grosse Gemeinsamkeit der christlichen Kunstepoche, die von 400 bis 1400 reicht, ist die Dominanz der Bilder über das 'Bild' (im emphatischen Sinn, die ihm die Neuzeit gibt) . . ." (p. 17). The images are arranged according to a certain syntax, with "konstante Relationsmuster" (*ibid.*). In this context it is important to note that Christianity is a religion in which a book—the Bible—is pivotal, a book that contains a historical narration.

In the first chapter, the author distinguishes between two different "genera

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

dicendi" or "modi." The first modus contains symbols (e.g. the lamb) and single figures: personifications (e.g. "ecclesia") or representative figures (like the evangelists, apostles, prophets etc.). The second modus contains narrative "historiae." All these images, narrative or not, are arranged according to a certain system, are part of a "Bildsystem" or "Bildsumme."

Depending on the kind of ordering one can have for example a centralizing building with the cupola or vault decorated with symbols or representative single figures, while the walls are painted with narrative scenes. Kemp refers to the presbytery frescoes in St. Georgen ob Judenburg (plates 1-2) and to the mosaics in the presbytery of San Vitale in Ravenna (figs. 2-4). Here the arrangement is a result of the so-called "Abstufung" of the different modi: the single and representative figures above and the narrative scenes below. The abstract symbols and personifications and the representative figures (appearing mostly in certain numbers: four, twelve etc.) are above, in heavenly spheres; the "historiae," that took place on earth, are located in lower spheres. A flat surface asks for a different arrangement: in that case the symbols and representative figures are in the centre, whereas the "historiae" are to be found in the periphery, around the central figures.

In the second chapter, certain Roman, non-Christian "Bildsumme" are discussed. Jews (Dura-Europos) and Christians adopted the image language and the principles of arrangement of the images from their neighbours, emphasizing their own "historiae," taken from the Bible.

The Christian reception of the Bible is the subject of the third chapter. The Christians were aware of the fact that they are involved in a history of God with his people, a history that they viewed as starting in biblical times and leading to the end of the world and the Second Coming of Christ. This history they believed to be irreversible: all that has happened or was happening has a unique, irreplaceable value, and will never happen again. This linear conception of history contrasts with the cyclical conception, to be found in the world where the first Christians lived. Saint Augustine renounced the cyclical system of the Pythagoreans and Stoics, citing Psalm 11:9: "In circuitu impii ambulant." He chooses the "via recta": the Bible is a narrative book, telling a story. This story is structured as follows: first is the word, than the action (God said and He made: Genesis 1); or first His promise, than the fulfilment (the Covenant to be realised).

The Christians adopted the biblical narrative, at the same time interpreting it in their own particular way. Here two methods are to be distinguished: the typological and the allegorical interpretation. The typology

(already used in the Bible itself) remains within the historical framework: what happened in the past is seen as a prefiguration of later events, what happens later is fulfilment of earlier history. Allegory, on the other hand, transforms historical facts into invisible realities, or historical figures into philosophical abstractions. These methods, already practised by Philo, are taken up by the Fathers of the Church. Thus narrative texts lose their historical meaning. In this context Philo may be quoted, who, for instance, considers Abraham, meeting Sarah, to be the finder of wisdom.

The fourth chapter discusses several illustrated Bible manuscripts. The author is especially interested in the relationship between word and image: what are the connections between the illustrations and the narrative text they illustrate? It turns out that the connections are manifold. The Cotton Genesis and the Vienna Genesis were lavishly illustrated. The original Cotton Genesis is supposed to have included circa 360 illustrations, the Vienna Genesis even more. Here we have a literal translation of a Bible text into images. The same holds true for the Quedlinburger Itala. The story of the Bible is retold illustrating every word.

In some instances the illustration adds something to the text. The miniaturist who, in the Vienna Genesis (plate 5), illustrated the story of Joseph and Potiphar was also inspired by the legend of Aseneth, mother of Ephraim and Manasseh. In the Codex of Rossano, a theological commentary is added to the illustration of the Parable of the Good Samaritan (plate 6): the Good Samaritan is represented as Christ, the inn as the Church, the innkeeper as a minister of the Church. Here patristical typological exegesis is expressed in a pictorial form. Moreover, one finds in this manuscript a certain kind of typology: underneath the picture of the Good Samaritan four prophets are represented. The texts shown on their scrolls are related to the above illustration.

Images in manuscripts can also serve to scan the text, to indicate where a book starts etc. Throughout the middle ages this has been an important function of book illustration. Thus the Gospels are preceded by the canon tables (the Rabbula Codex gives an early example: figs. 27-29). Each Gospel (so the Rossano Codex) opens with a portrait of the evangelist.

The fifth chapter treats the mosaics in Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome. The mosaics in the nave illustrate the story of the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham. The pictures on the left wall illustrate a family history: Abraham becomes a people (Genesis). The right wall shows how that people got a land: it is the story of the exodus from Egypt and the entry into the Promised Land (Exodus and Joshua). The nave mosaics do not

have a theological or sacramental character. They do not contain scenes that can easily be connected with the New Covenant or the sacraments (such as the Manna, the Golden Calf, the Bronze Snake). The illustrations give only the "sensus historicus." In Kemp's view there is a parallel with comtemporary Latin bible poetry, where one is not concerned with commentary or allegory, but only with retelling the biblical story. As an example Kemp also points to a poet like Prudentius who—while normally much concerned with allegory—gives a series of "tituli," where typology plays a rather modest role (p. 166).

The mosaics of the triumphal arch (figs. 37-39), illustrating the manifestation of the promised Messiah, are quite different from the, mainly narrative, nave mosaics. First, there are the symbolic signs: in the top center part, the empty throne, a jewelled cross, the scroll sealed with seven seals, the four living creatures. The bottom part, on both sides, shows a city and six symbolic lambs: Jerusalem and Bethlehem and the faithful "ex circumcisione" and "ex gentibus." Secondly, the narration is systematized to a great extent. Not everywhere the historical sequence of the facts is followed, because one preferred a theological scheme: in the first narrative zone Christ appears to his own people, in the second zone He appears to the strangers, and in the lowest zone Herod is represented, the enemy, who did not succeed in killing the newborn King. Because of this scheme the Adoration of the Magi is represented in the second zone, and only in the third zone we see what happened before: the visit of the Magi to Herodes. The passing of time—intrinsic to the narrative—is limited as much as possible: from the moment of Annunciation—her son has not even been born—Maria is surrounded by an imperial guard of angels.

Chapter six discusses Early Christian ivories, especially ivories going back to the scheme and the iconography of the consular and imperial diptychs. A consular diptych shows the consul, sitting in his tribune, and holding the mappa in his hand about to signal the start of the games that he has granted upon his accession to office. The games sponsored by the consul are represented below or in the second dyptich leaf (figs. 40, 42). The portrait of the consul has a representative, hieratic character. Not only the consul, but also the personifications of Rome and Constantinople and clipei with the portraits of the emperor and empress are part of the composition.

The Carrand diptych (Florence, Bargello) has a special iconography (fig. 41). In the left leaf St. Paul shakes off the snake in the fire (Acts 28:5). Next to Paul we see Publius, the chief official of Malta, acknowledging the miracle, his right hand raised. Above, St. Paul is again represented, this

time as a teacher, seated between two disciples. On the right leaf Adam is represented, giving names to the birds and the beasts. Kathleen Shelton[3] has argued that the commissioner of the diptych, a high official, identifies himself with the prefect of Malta, represented in the centre of the left leaf. Kemp does not dispute the existence of diptychs, commissioned by high officials, who were not consul. Yet for him there are reasons to suppose that the Bargello ivories form a consular diptych. The paradisiac scene of Adam amidst the animals is interpreted by Kemp as a Christian counterpart of the bloody games and "venationes" that accompany the new consul's accession to office. The two, seemingly disconnected leafs are in fact connected in a subtle way. In both pieces biblical narrative is involved: nature (Adam and the animals) versus history (St. Paul in Malta), the speaking, name giving Adam versus the teaching Paul.

There is also a link between imperial diptychs—diptychs given by a consul to the emperor—and diptychs with a Christian iconography. Kemp compares the Barberini ivory (a leaf from an imperial diptych, Musée du Louvre in Paris: fig. 47) with a leaf from the Murano diptych (Museo Archeologico in Ravenna: fig. 46). The Barberini ivory shows in the centre panel an emperor on horseback, surrounded by a group of barbarians bringing their tribute (below), the two consuls (on both sides of the emperor) and an "imago clipeata" of Christ, held by angels (in the upper part). The same outline is used in the Murano ivory: Christ throned in the centre, the consuls and the barbarians replaced by historical, biblical scenes. The Christian ivory is more extensive and has more compartments than the imperial ivory, because narrative scenes have been added: "Die Narration ist die notwendige Zutat einer Religion, die sich den Heilsbringer nur im Rahmen einer Heilsgeschichte vorstellen kann . . ." (p. 207).

An ivory in the Castello Sforzesco in Milan (fig. 51), illustrating the holy women at the tomb, is completely filled with "narratio": the Resurrection is represented by the empty tomb and by the miracles—among others the raising of Lazarus—represented on the doors of the sepulchre. Here there is continuity between prefiguration and fulfilment.

The last chapter is devoted to the wooden doors of Santa Sabina in Rome and of Sant'Ambrogio in Milan. The Santa Sabina door illustrates a continuous story, at the same time showing some typological relations. Rows of horizontal and vertical panels alternate. It is natural to "read" the four rows with horizontal panels, as well as the three rows with vertical panels, from left to right. The program, as reconstructed by Kemp (p. 224), illustrates a continuing story, starting with the vocation of Moses

(the panel in the left bottom corner: note the rolled up scroll in the hand of God: fig. 55). The story ends with the Second Coming of Christ (note the rolled out scroll in Christ's hand: fig. 63) and the "traditio legis" (the panel in the upper right corner).

In addition to the horizontalism of the different zones, a certain verticalism is apparent. Each of the two door leafs is subdivided into two vertical "columns." Each column consists of alternating horizontal and vertical panels and is framed by a pronounced moulding decorated with vines. These columns are to be read in a vertical manner: above the vocation of Moses we see (i.e. according to Kemp's reconstruction) the Nativity, and above that a hieratic scene interpreted by Kemp as the inauguration of a bishop or the acclamation of Christ as the Eternal High Priest (p. 226, fig. 62). Above the Crossing of the Red Sea, the baptism of Christ is shown. Above the miracles performed by Moses, the miracles of Christ. Above Elijah taken up to heaven, we see Christ's Ascension, the Second Coming and the "traditio legis." Thus the vertical columns have a typological content.

All the scenes depicted in the door decoration are determined by a continuous historical line. But also on a smaller scale continuity is reflected, for instance in the second zone from below. The first three panels illustrate Moses' actions. The fourth panel is dedicated to Elijah's ascension. Yet Elijah is regarded in the Bible as a second Moses: like Moses Elijah was fed and refreshed in the desert (1 Kings 17:6; 19:6), he crossed the Jordan on dry ground (2 Kings 2:8). Elijah is succeeded by Elisha, who, like Moses and Elijah, performed miracles, as is shown by the spring and the ax, below on the relief that illustrates Elijah's ascension (fig. 61: cf. 2 Kings 2:19 ss. and 6:1 ss.). Thus the history of salvation is continued.

So far, a condensed review of Kemp's—sometimes quite elaborate—observations. The author teaches the reader how to look at complex systems of images, and "read" the images. The stories that are read are narrative stories. They are an essential part of Christian art, as they are inextricably bound up with the Bible. Even though the Church Fathers may allegorise, it is still the artist who tells a story: compare, for instance, the story of David on the door of Sant'Ambrogio in Milan with Ambrosius' interpretation of that story (Kemp pp. 264-265). At the same time, the author sensitizes the reader—or rather, the viewer—to the outlines that the artist has taken partly from non-Christian antiquity, and that he uses to classify his material in order to connect history to cosmic arrangements.

Some of Kemp's interpretations seem to me very astute and profound, for example his analysis of the miniatures in fol. 1r of the Quedlinburg Itala (pp. 103-109, 118-124, figs. 21-22), or his discussion of the Carrand diptych (pp. 185-200).

Yet sometimes the author seems to take his analysis and interpretations a little too far, like when he discusses the relief with the miracles of Moses and notices things that the reviewer is at a loss to see. In the upper scene Moses is standing between the hand of God and a tree (fig. 59). The tree symbolises nature, or—to be more precise—the four elements. The four elements are subdued by four miracles (see p. 246): the water of the Red Sea is divided (the second relief of the second zone below: fig. 57), water flowing in the dry and barren earth of the desert (third relief: fig. 59), manna and quails coming down from the air (third relief), fire causing the ascension of Elijah (fourth relief: fig. 61). Kemp quotes St. Gregory of Nyssa, according to whom the four elements are obedient to Moses. However, one cannot help noticing that the sculptor has not made the slightest effort to represent the air, for instance by means of a personification. One can wonder if the rock from which Moses lets the water rise by striking it can be equated with the element "earth." The fire does not belong to Moses but to Elijah. Moreover, in the relief depicting Elijah taken up to heaven, the chariot is represented, not the fire.

While discussing the door of Sant'Ambrogio, the author takes a closer look at the reliefs telling the story of the election of David (1 Samuel 16: plates 14-15). We first see Samuel entering the house of Jesse, while David is fighting a lion (1 Samuel 17:34 ss.), then a messenger summoning David, who is seated, the defeated lion at his feet, and finally, in the upper zone, Samuel putting ointment on David. Kemp contrasts the upper and lower level: below two lively David scenes, in the upper zone twice a representative scene with Samuel between Jesse and his sons. In this zone "regiert die Statik, die Parataxe, die Isokephalie" (p. 245). Nature is contrasted with culture. The author goes so far as to connect this contrast with the "Übergang von der naturnahen Epoche der Patriarchen zur organisierten Gesellschaft der Königszeit" (*ibid.*). In my opinion these kinds of suggestions are far-fetched.

In a few cases Kemp chooses an interpretation, where, according to me, other interpretations cannot be excluded. Kemp notes that, on the left wall of Santa Maria Maggiore,[4] the narrative starts with the meeting between Abraham and Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18: plate 8), whereas, according to the historical sequence of events, the separation between Abraham and Lot

should have preceded (Gen. 13). The author refers to the well established interpretation that for typological reasons the sacrifice of Melchizedek was put as closely as possible to the altar. He rejects this interpretation, and argues that Melchizedek blesses Abraham as victor. The victory of Abraham, the opening scene of the cycle, will eventually lead to the birth of a people and the possession of a land, the main themes of the mosaics in the nave (pp. 151-154). There are reasons, however, to hold on to the typological interpretation. Ernst Kitzinger has contrasted the "epic mode" of the nave mosaics with the imperial, hieratic style of the mosaics of the triumphal arch. He notes that the nave mosaics become more solemn and ceremonial as they near the triumphal arch.[5] This may justify relating the first mosaic of the left wall to the New Testament mosaics, not only with regard to style, but also to content, and to link it with the altar.

I also do not agree completely with the author's interpretation of the mosaics in San Vitale at Ravenna. He describes the Moses scenes on the right wall of the presbytery (p. 238, fig. 2): on the left we see the burning bush and Moses who takes off his sandals. Underneath Moses, according to Kemp, leaves the site of the theophany, "durch seine Herde hindurchschreitend." He holds, in a proleptical way, the scroll he has to receive from God in the next scene on the opposite wall (fig. 3). It seems to me that on the left wall Moses is represented, tending the flock of Jethro. He does not walk, but stands still, stroking a sheep. Being a prophet, he is dressed in tunica and pallium: in Early Christian iconography the typical garment of a teacher. A scroll is the attribute that belong to this outfit. Next we see the scenes of the burning bush and of Moses receiving the Law.

Kemp's book contains a wealth of information and thoughts, with the interdisciplinary character adding to its richness: the author has entered the fields of Early Christian archaeology, history of art, biblical exegesis, patristics and study of literature.

Finally, one more thing. As the title of Kemp's book indicates, it deals primarily with structures of Christian art, discussing several Early Christian artefacts in an exemplary fashion. Occasionaly also later, mediaeval works of art are described: the book opens with thirteenth-century frescoes in St. Georgen ob Judenburg (plates 1-2). Other works that he addresses are: frescoes from the thirteenth century in Brunswick (pp. 36-39, figs. 5-6), an Ottonian diptych in Berlin (pp. 217-221, plate 16) and, in the epilogue, the Anglo-Saxon "Franks Casket" in the British Museum (pp. 272-274: figs. 64-65), insular animal decoration (pp. 276-277: fig. 66), the Late Carolingian

golden altar-frontal in Sant'Ambrogio in Milan (pp. 278-281: figs. 67-69) and the Annunciation of Jan van Eyck in Washington (pp. 281-286: figs. 70-71). I am wondering if it would not have been better to focus on the Early Christian epoch. His leaps from this period to works of art dating, in some instances, many centuries later are too big, in spite of the fact that principles, based on Early Christian works of art—which Kemp describes quite lucidly—may be applied to art of later periods.

Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit P.C.J. VAN DAEL

NOTES

[1] Cf. W. Kemp, "Mittelalterliche Bildsysteme," in: *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 22 (1989), p. 121 ss. This article is to be considered as a first draft of the book reviewed (see p. 290, note 32).

[2] *Sermo corporeus. Die Erzählung der mittelalterlichen Glasfenster*, München 1987; "Visual Narratives, Memory, and the Medieval *Esprit de système*," in: S. Küchler and W. Melion (eds.), *Images and Memory. On Remembering and Representation*. Washington-London 1991, p. 87 ss.

[3] K.J. Shelton, "Roman Aristocrats, Christian Commissions: The Carrand Diptych," in: *Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity* (F.M. Clover and R.S. Humphreys eds.). Madison (Wisconsin) 1989, p. 105 ss.

[4] He refers to the north wall (pp. 150-151). Actually the wall is situated south-west.

[5] Ernst Kitzinger, *Byzantine Art in the Making*. Cambridge, Mass., 1977, pp. 66-75.

DIE MAHLGEBETE IN *DIDACHE* KAP. 9-10

EIN NEUER *STATUS QUAESTIONIS*

VON

WILLY RORDORF

Seit dem letzten Status quaestionis über die Forschung zu diesen Didache-Kapiteln,[1] den ich im Zusammenhang mit meiner Vorbereitung der Didache-Ausgabe in den *Sources Chrétiennes*[2] schrieb, sind 20 Jahre verflossen. Im Blick auf die Neuauflage ist es an der Zeit, die inzwischen erschienene Literatur aufzuarbeiten und kritisch darzustellen. Der besseren Uebersichtlichkeit halber werde ich nicht strikt chronologisch vorgehen, sondern die Materie in zwei Kapitel einteilen, wobei es dann allerdings unvermeidlich ist, dass die eine oder andere Arbeit an verschiedenen Stellen auftaucht.

Zuerst werde ich ein textkritisches Problem erwähnen, das mit der alten koptischen Uebersetzung der Didache zusammenhängt und aus dem in letzter Zeit weitreichende Folgerungen gezogen worden sind; anschliessend muss ich—wie könnte es anders sein?—eingehend auf die alte und wohl kaum je ganz zu lösende Streitfrage zurückkommen, ob es sich in den Mahlgebeten von Didache 9-10 lediglich um eine rituelle Mahlfeier handelt oder ob wir darin eine etwas besondere Form der Eucharistie zu sehen haben, oder ob Didache 9-10 eher Anlass gibt zur Annahme, dass die beiden, Mahlfeier und Eucharistie, als aufeinander folgend anzusehen sind.

1. *Ein textkritisches Problem*

Bekanntlich ist auf einem Londoner Papyrusfragment des 5. Jahrhunderts ein längerer Auszug aus einer koptischen Didache-Uebersetzung erhalten, die den Text von Did. 10,3b-12,2a bietet.[3] Es handelt sich um drei Kolumnen, von denen die ersten zwei auf dem Recto, die dritte auf dem Verso des Blattes stehen. Die Kolumnen bieten aber ein eigenartiges Bild: während die erste einen 17 cm breiten Schriftspiegel aufweist, der nach unten zu sich noch verbreitert, sind die folgenden zwei Kolumnen auffällig schmal (12 cm). Der Schreiber hätte durchaus im Stil der ersten Kolumne weiterfahren können und hätte dadurch den ganzen von ihm kopierten

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 229-246

Text auf der Recto-Seite untergebracht. Aber so war er gezwungen, auf der Verso-Seite den restlichen Text unterzubringen (siehe Clayton N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context. Essays on Its text, History & Transmission*, Leiden 1995, Plate 1 und 2).

Die Erklärung dieses Phänomens hat den Forschern schon seit der Entdeckung des Fragments im Jahre 1923 Kopfzerbrechen bereitet. G. Horner (1924) und C. Schmidt (1925) erklärten sich die merkwürdige Tatsache damit, dass hier ein Kopist eine Schreibübung gemacht habe und darum mitten im Satz von Did. 10,3b begonnen und ebenso willkürlich mit Did. 12,2a aufgehört habe. J.-P. Audet (1953) hat allerdings behauptet, der abrupte Anfang setze zumindest *eine* voraufgehende Textkolumne voraus, die jetzt verloren sei, und meinte Buchstabenreste links der Zeilen 8 und 9 der ersten Kolumne zu erkennen; das Blatt sei demnach das Ende einer Papyrusrolle. Diese Deutung herrschte hernach vor,[4] und im neuen Katalog der koptischen Handschriften der British Library[5] heisst es bereits sehr affirmativ, dass das Blatt "from the innermost end of a roll" stamme, und dass "a few letter traces" von einer voraufgehenden Kolumne sichtbar seien.

Kann es da verwundern, dass zwei amerikanische Forscher, *Clayton N. Jefford* und *Steven J. Patterson*[6] auf die Idee gekommen sind, aus dieser Tatsache weitreichende Folgerungen zu ziehen? Erstens einmal, sagen sie, erhellt diese Tatsache die merkwürdige Schriftkolumnenverteilung auf dem Blatt. Da wir annehmen können, dass auf der linkerhand vorauszusetzenden Papyrusrolle nicht nur *eine* Textkolumne, sondern der ganze Anfang der Didache, also Kap. 1-10,3a zu lesen stand, wollte der Schreiber am Ende der Rolle rechts eine leere Stelle lassen, wo man beim Lesen die Rolle halten konnte, und hat *darum* die zweite Kolumne auf der Recto-Seite verschmälert und den Rest auf die Rückseite des Papyrus geschrieben. Wenn dem aber so ist, dann besteht die Möglichkeit zu der berechtigten Annahme, dass der Text nicht zufällig mit Did. 12,2a aufhört, sondern dass da die koptische Uebersetzung der Didache zur Zeit des Schreibers, also im 5. Jahrhundert, ihr Ende nahm. Da wir aber keinen älteren Textzeugen für die Kap. 12,2b-16 der Didache zur Verfügung haben (die Apostolischen Konstitutionen, welche im 7. Buch die Didache paraphrasieren, sind vom Ende des 4. Jahrhunderts, also etwa gleichzeitig, und die Jerusalemer Handschrift der ganzen griechischen Didache stammt sogar erst aus dem Jahre 1056), ist es nicht auszuschliessen, dass die koptische Version den *ursprünglichen Schluss* der ganzen Schrift mit Kap. 12,2a bietet.

Diese einigermassen revolutionäre These ist von den beiden Amerikanern mit weiteren, inhaltlichen Argumenten untermauert worden. Zuerst berufen

sie sich auf Kurt Niederwimmer,[7] der auf die inneren Spannungen, die in den Kapiteln 11-13 der griechischen Didache vorliegen, hinweist und sie dadurch zu erklären sucht, dass er eine Vorlage postuliert, die der Didachist ergänzt hat. Jefford und Patterson hingegen glauben, dass sich die Probleme besser lösen lassen, wenn man annimmt, dass Did. 11-12,2a später, unter den veränderten Bedingungen der Gemeindesituation, mit neuen Bestimmungen ab Did. 12,2b bis und mit Kap. 16 ergänzt worden ist. Steven J. Patterson[8] hat diesen Standpunkt kürzlich noch weiter ausgeführt. Da wir uns in diesem Status quaestionis aber nicht mit den Kapiteln 11-13 beschäftigen wollen, gehe ich jetzt nicht näher darauf ein.[9]

Wichtiger für unsern Zusammenhang ist die mit der neuen These gekoppelte Folgerung, dass dann auch der koptische Text des liturgischen Kapitels 10 dem entsprechenden griechischen Text vorgezogen werden sollte. Jefford und Patterson selber haben das allerdings nur in einem wenig überzeugenden Ansatz versucht, der den Anfang des Textes in 10,3b betrifft.[10] Sie behaupten, der griechische Text ("Du, allmächtiger Herrscher, hast das All geschaffen um Deines Namens willen, Speise und Trank hast du den Menschen gegeben zum Genuss, damit sie dir danken. Uns aber hast du geistliche Speise und Trank und ewiges Leben durch deinen Knecht geschenkt") sei eine Abschwächung eines ursprünglichen koptischen Textes, der anstelle von "Menschen" "Menschenkinder" gesagt habe und den Finalsatz "damit sie dir danken" noch nicht geboten habe. Damit erweise sich aber der koptische Text als Ausdruck eines gnostischen Denkens in zwei Kategorien: die "Menschenkinder" seien die "draussen," von denen die Insider ("wir") sich abhöben. Davon kann jedoch keine Rede sein. Der ganze Anfang des Gebetes, in dem vom allmächtigen Schöpfer gesprochen wird,[11] ist völlig undenkbar in einem gnostischen Kontext.

John W. Riggs, von dem auch noch später die Rede sein wird, hat aber die textkritische Bedeutung der koptischen Uebersetzung stark herausgestrichen.[12] Er stellt die textkritische Regel auf: wo die koptische Uebersetzung mit dem griechischen Text oder der georgischen Uebersetzung[13] zusammengehe, verdiene sie auf jeden Fall den Vorzug, wo nicht, seien ihre Lesarten trotzdem ernstlich in Betracht zu ziehen. Dann ist die Rechnung schnell gemacht: 10,3b ist nach der koptischen Uebersetzung zu lesen (s. oben).[14] In 10,4 wird περὶ πάντων vorgezogen. In 10,5 wird τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν ausgelassen, in 10,6 κύριος anstelle von χάρις und οἶκος anstelle von θεός gelesen. Um so mehr muss es auffallen, dass Riggs sich zum wichtigsten Punkt, der Zufügung des Myron/stinoufi-Gebets am Ende des Kapitels sehr zurückhaltend äussert; er gibt einfach die verschiedenen

Forschungshypothesen wieder, ohne seine eigene Meinung bekanntzugeben.[15]

Die neue Wertschätzung des koptischen Uebersetzungsfragments ist jedoch nicht unwidersprochen geblieben. Wir haben hier vor allem die Studie von *F. Stanley Jones* und *Paul A. Mirecki* "Considerations on the Coptic Papyrus of the *Didache* (British Library Oriental Manuscripts 9271)"[16] zu erwähnen. Paul A. Mirecki hat das Verdienst, die koptische Uebersetzung neu ediert zu haben; seine Edition ist um einiges zuverlässiger als diejenigen seiner Vorgänger (G. Horner, C. Schmidt und L.-Th. Lefort), sie kann wohl als definitiv gelten. F. Stanley Jones seinerseits untersucht im angegebenen Artikel eingehend die Frage der merkwürdigen Anordnung der Kolumnen auf dem Papyrusblatt. Er hält es für ausgeschlossen, dass Horner und Schmidt nichts von den Buchstabenresten einer vorhergehenden Kolumne gesagt hätten, wenn sie sie gesehen hätten. Ausserdem werden im 5. Jahrhundert von den Christen keine Papyrusrollen mehr benützt. Damit ist die Hypothese, dass es sich bei dem Papyrusfragment um das Ende einer Papyrusrolle gehandelt hat, welche ursprünglich die ganze Didache enthielt, sehr fragwürdig geworden. Die auf den ersten Blick so einleuchtende Bemerkung, der Schreiber habe die 2. Kolumne auf der Recto-Seite verschmälert, um dem Leser die Möglichkeit zu geben, die Rolle auf dem freien Rand rechts mit der Hand zu halten, ist auch nicht stichhaltig; denn auf der Verso-Seite hat der Schreiber die 3. Kolumne just dort begonnen, wo man die Rolle hätte halten müssen! Dann ist die Textanordnung auf dem koptischen Papyrusfragment aber auch kein Argument mehr zur Behauptung, die ursprüngliche Didache habe mit Kapitel 12,2a geschlossen. Der Vers 12,2a ist ja wirklich auch nicht der Schluss, den man erwarten würde.[17] Man muss also wohl doch zur früheren Annahme zurückkehren, wonach es sich beim koptischen Papyrusfragment von London um eine Schreiberübung handelt, die zufällig mit Did. 10,3b beginnt und ebenso zufällig mit Did. 12,2a aufhört. Der Schreiber hat ein Doppelblatt benützt, das eigentlich in der Mitte gefaltet für einen Codex bestimmt war. Aber wenn das Doppelblatt ein fehlendes Blatt in einem bestehenden Codex hätte ersetzen sollen, dann hätte der Schreiber auf der rechten Seite zu schreiben begonnen. Möglich ist allenfalls noch, dass er nur das halbe Blatt doppelseitig beschreiben wollte, dann aber seine Absicht geändert hat. Auf jeden Fall bleibt es auch so ein Rätsel, warum der Schreiber die 2. und 3. Kolumne so geschrieben hat, wie er sie geschrieben hat. Denn Mirecki und Jones haben—eine Beobachtung Schmidts aufnehmend—nachgewiesen, dass der Text ohnehin nicht in einem Zug geschrieben worden ist, sondern zuerst die Zeilen 1-14 der ersten Kolumne (bis zum "Amen"), später

erst der Rest der 1. Kolumne und die Kolumnen 2 und 3, mit anderer Tinte und in dickerer Schrift. Wenn derselbe Schreiber (oder ein anderer?) nochmals ansetzte, um die Abschrift fortzusetzen, dann hatte er offenbar doch ein gewisses Interesse am Inhalt des Textes, den er kopierte. Die schmaleren Kolumnen 2 und 3 sind dabei vielleicht auf einen schmaleren Kolumnenspiegel der Schreibervorlage zurückzuführen.[18]

Da die Jefford-Patterson'sche Theorie einer "Ur-Didache," die nur die Kap. 1-12,2a enthalten hätte, dadurch ins Wanken geraten ist, können wir auch die variae lectiones der koptischen Uebersetzung gegenüber dem griechischen Text in ihrem textkritischen Wert mit kühlerem Kopf betrachten, nämlich ohne das Vorurteil, sie müssten in *jedem* Fall dem griechischen Text vorgezogen werden. Dass sie angesichts ihres hohen Alters als eine ernstzunehmende Alternative zu gelten haben, ist freilich klar. André Tuilier und ich haben in unserer Ausgabe damit gerechnet, dass die koptische Uebersetzung an verschiedenen Stellen gegenüber dem griechischen Text den Vorzug verdienen könnte:[19] in Did. 10,3 υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Semitismus) anstelle von ἀνθρώποις und die Auslassung von ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν; die Einfügung von Ἰησοῦ ist hier sogar ein Erfordernis (angesichts der Parallelen in 9,2b.3b; 10,2b), sowie die Korrektur des σύ in σοί in Did. 10,4, die schon Bryennios vornahm. Wir waren allerdings auch der Ansicht,[20] dass in Did. 10,6 die koptische Uebersetzung τῷ οἴκῳ Δαυίδ gegenüber τῷ θεῷ Δαυίδ sekundär ist.[21] Und ganz entschieden muss hier der sekundäre Charakter der "Amen"—Einfügungen in die koptische Uebersetzung sowie das Anhängsel des Myron/stinoufi-Gebets unterstrichen werden, die beide eine liturgische Weiterentwicklung des koptischen Fragments gegenüber dem griechischen Text attestieren; darüber ist das Nötige im Kommentar von K. Niederwimmer[22] gesagt, auch gegenüber K. Wengst, der das Myrongebet in griechischer Rückübersetzung sogar in den Text seiner Edition aufnahm,[23] sowie gegenüber S. Gero,[24] der das Myrongebet als Krankensalbölgebet zu interpretieren versuchte.

2. *Rituelle Mahlfeier oder Eucharistie oder beides?*

Im Rubriktitel (Did. 9,1) ist unumwunden von der εὐχαριστία die Rede; derselbe Ausdruck kommt auch in der Zwischenbemerkung Did. 9,5 vor und ist hier sogar mit der Aussage verbunden, die Nichtgetauften dürften nicht daran teilnehmen. Andererseits ist aber nirgends der Einsetzungsbericht Jesu erwähnt, noch wird deutlich auf den Tod Jesu angespielt. Zudem ist es ganz klar, dass die Feier mit einem vollständigen Mahl verbunden

ist (Did. 10,1) und dass die Schlussbemerkung in Did. 10,6b auf eine nicht präzisierte Fortsetzung der Feier schliessen lässt. Ich habe darum aufgrund der sehr grossen Verwandtschaft der Didachegebete mit dem jüdischen Segensspruch über Wein und Brot (in *dieser* Reihenfolge wie in Did. 9!) und mit dem jüdischen Nachtischgebet Birkat ha-mazon (Did. 10) vermutet, die Kapitel 9-10 der Didache würden uns das christianisierte Vor- und Nachtischgebet bei einer rituellen Mahlfeier überliefern, auf das die Eucharistiekommunion erst folgte. Diese Interpretation ist im grossen und ganzen von zwei neueren Kommentatoren der Didache, nämlich von *K. Niederwimmer*[25] und von *G. Schöllgen*[26] übernommen worden.[27] Aber daneben gibt es eine Gruppe von Forschern, die annehmen, es handle sich bei den Didachegebeten um die Eucharistiefeier als solche. Freilich teilt sie sich deutlich in zwei Untergruppen: die eine gibt zu, dass die beiden Kapitel *nicht* die *vollständige* Liturgie der Eucharistie bieten, die andere jedoch erkühnt sich zu der Behauptung, die eucharistische Liturgie sei uns in der Didache *vollständig* erhalten.

Bevor wir aber die Vertreter der beiden Richtungen kritisch würdigen, muss ich noch auf einen Sonderfall hinweisen. *Enrico Mazza* hat schon 1978 (also im Erscheinungsjahr unserer Didacheausgabe) seine Sicht der Dinge vorgetragen.[28] Mazza bemerkt zuerst mit Recht, dass man den missverständlichen Ausdruck "Agape" für eine so frühe Schrift wie die Didache vermeiden sollte, da der technische Begriff Agape das stark von karitativen Motiven bestimmte Liebesmahl der Christen *nach der Abspaltung* des Mahles von der Eucharistie, also im vorgeschrittenen 2. Jahrhundert, bezeichne. Ich stimme ihm zu und werde in Zukunft von der "rituellen Mahlfeier" in Did. 9-10 sprechen. Mazza trifft nun aber eine Vorentscheidung in bezug auf das Redaktionsdatum der Didache, die ihm nicht jedermann wird abnehmen können: er sieht in dem in Did. 9,2 angesprochenen "heiligen Weinstock Davids" das ausschliesslich jüdisch verstandene "Reich Davids" und konstruiert daraus einen Gegensatz zu der Oeffnung des Judenchristentums für die Heidenmission, wie sie auf dem Apostelkonzil von Acta 15 angenommen wurde, was ihn postulieren lässt, dass die Didachegebete in diesem Fall zumindest vor dem Jahr 48/49 geschrieben sein müssten (In Wirklichkeit rechnet Mazza sogar mit 3-4 Jahren nach Jesu Tod und Auferstehung!). Das Fehlen des Einsetzungsberichts habe darum kein entscheidendes Gewicht: wir fänden ja auch spätere Eucharistieliturgien ohne Einsetzungsbericht (z.B. die Anaphora von Addai und Mari), wichtig sei nur, dass der anamnetische Konnex zu Tod und Auferstehung Jesu durch die Feier sichtbar gemacht werde. Was die Didache im beson-

deren betreffe, sei dieser Konnex noch im Bewusstsein der Feiernden und müsse darum nicht spezifiziert werden. Did. 10,3 genüge: der erste Versteil nehme die Aufforderung von Deuteronomium 10,8 zur Berakah beim Mahl auf, der 2. Versteil mache die Beziehung zu Christus deutlich.[29]

Meine Bedenken gegenüber Mazzas Deutungsversuch der Didachegebete in Kapitel 9-10 sind hauptsächlich chronologischer Art. Die *jetzige* Gestalt der Didache ist eindeutig dem Heidenchristentum gegenüber aufgeschlossen. Das geht nicht nur aus dem zweiten Titel der Schrift hervor ("Lehre des Herrn durch die 12 Apostel an die Heiden"), der sekundär ist, sondern durch eine Reihe von deutlichen Anspielungen im Text (vgl. Did. 2,2; 3,4; 6,3; 15,1). Wenn dem aber so ist, so ist es m.E. undenkbar, dass die Gebete von Did. 9-10, die nach Mazza so urjüdisch gewesen sein sollen, nicht deutlicher modifiziert oder zumindest vom Didachisten für heidenchristliche Ohren erklärt worden wären. In dieser Zeit (nach mir um ca. 100 n. Chr.) war auch die Erinnerung an die Osterereignisse nicht mehr jedermann so unmittelbar gegenwärtig.[30]

Und nun also die beiden erwähnten Gruppen von Forschern! In die erste Gruppe gehört *Karl Christian Felmy*.[31] Im Grunde genommen ist der Unterschied seiner Deutung zu der meinigen minim. Auch er sieht in Didache 9-10 die ursprüngliche Herrenmahlfeier, bei der die Eucharistie auf das Mahl folgt, nur unterstreicht er, Did. 10 sei das vollständige Eucharistiegebet, worauf—nach 10,6—nur noch der Kommunionsempfang folge. Trotzdem möchte er den Einsetzungsbericht nicht missen. Er deutet ihn als Festhaggada (in Analogie zur jüdischen Passahhaggada) und glaubt, dass er darum ursprünglich nicht zu den Eucharistiegebeten gehörte, sondern vorher—wo genau, weiss auch Felmy nicht zu sagen—seinen Platz gehabt hat, bis er, nach Wegfall des Sättigungsmahls, in die Eucharistiegebete hineingenommen wurde.

Die Schwäche der These Felmys besteht darin, dass er von einem *jährlichen* jüdischen Brauch (der Passahfeier) auf den *wöchentlichen* christlichen Eucharistiegottesdienst schliesst. Wenn eine Feier nur einmal jährlich stattfindet, dann muss man den Kindern und Neuhinzugekommenen erklären, was da vor sich geht, nicht aber bei einer wöchentlich wiederkehrenden Feier. Es scheint mir also wenig wahrscheinlich, dass der Einsetzungsbericht je die Funktion einer Festhaggada hatte.

An dieser Stelle muss auch *Lothar Wehr* erwähnt werden, der in seiner Monographie "Arznei der Unsterblichkeit. Die Eucharistie bei Ignatius von Antiochien und im Johannesevangelium"[32] auch ein Kapitel den Mahlgebeten in der Didache widmet (333-356). Nach ihm ist in Did. 9-10 auch

das eucharistische Herrenmahl nach dem Muster von 1. Kor. 11,23 ff. vorauszusetzen. Freilich legt er auf Did. 9,5 das entscheidende Gewicht, um zu folgern, während des Mahles (also zwischen Did. 9,5 und 10,1) sei die Kommunion erfolgt. Da aus dieser Sicht das Traditionsstück 10,6 an seiner jetzigen Stelle nach den Nachtischgebeten schwer erklärbar ist, wird es kurzerhand "unschädlich" gemacht:[33] "Es ist erst vom Didachisten—vielleicht aus aktuellem Anlass—durch 9,5 ersetzt und wegen seines eschatologischen Gehalts ans Ende der Dankgebete gestellt worden" (346). Wehr rechnet dann durchaus damit—er zitiert dazu Felmys Arbeit—, dass der Einsetzungsbericht hier auch noch seinen Platz gehabt haben kann: "Es ist ohne weiteres denkbar, dass die Einsetzungsworte erst während des Mahles unmittelbar vor dem Verzehr der Eucharistie gesprochen wurden" (349). Es ist klar, dass ich einem so gewaltsamen Eingriff in den Text, um die Probleme, die er stellt, aus der Welt zu schaffen, nicht zustimmen kann. Es soll aber nicht unerwähnt bleiben, dass Wehr im Zusammenhang seiner Arbeit einen nützlichen Vergleich der Didache mit dem Johannesevangelium und mit den Ignatianen anstellt, der ihn zum Schluss führt: "In mancher Hinsicht kann also die Eucharistieanschauung der Did als eine Vorstufe derjenigen des Johannes und des Ign angesehen werden" (356).

Der dritte Autor der ersten Gruppe ist kein geringerer als *Klaus Gamber*, der seine ganze Gelehrsamkeit aufgeboten hat, um endlich Licht in das Dunkel unseres Problems zu bringen.[34] Seine Zusammenfassung des Ergebnisses lautet: "Die Gestalt, in der die Agape-Eucharistie, das 'Herrenmahl,' bis zu Beginn des 2. Jh. begangen wurde, war dem Ritus nach weitgehend identisch mit dem Abschiedsmahl Jesu 'in der Nacht, da er verraten ward,' und das selbst wieder nach dem Ritus eines jüdischen Chabura-Mahles, wie es im Freundeskreis begangen wurde, verlaufen war. Charakteristisch sind dabei der einleitende (Kiddusch-) Becher, gefolgt vom eucharistischen Brotbrechen, während der eucharistische Kelch, der 'Becher der Segnung,' erst nach der Agape dargebracht und den Anwesenden gereicht wurde" (31). Gamber setzt dementsprechend voraus, dass die Rezitation des Einsetzungsberichts und die Kommunion in zwei Teilen erfolgte: der Segen über das Brot und die Brotkommunion nach Did. 9,4, und der Segen über den Wein und die Weinkommunion nach Did. 10,6. Zu dieser Annahme glaubt sich Gamber anhand der späteren ägyptischen Eucharistieformulare wie hauptsächlich dem Papyrus von Der Balaisa und der Serapion-Anaphora berechtigt, die bekanntlich Anklänge an die Didachegebete aufweisen, und aufgrund der Didacheparaphrase der Apostolischen Konstitutionen (VII,25), die Gamber kurzerhand schon auf das 2. Jahrhundert

zurückführt. Man kann viel aufschlussreiche Details besonders auch in bezug auf die jüdische Tradition aus Gambers Arbeit erfahren, das sei dankend erwähnt, aber methodisch scheint sein Ansatz doch fragwürdig. Jedenfalls bleibt auch sein Lösungsversuch eine blosse Hypothese.

Wenden wir uns nun der zweiten Gruppe der neueren Erklärungsversuche zu. Für sie ist charakteristisch, dass sie in Did. 9-10 eine *vollständige* Eucharistieliturgie finden zu können glauben. Die Vertreter dieser Sicht werden immer zahlreicher.

An erster Stelle steht der Kommentar von *Klaus Wengst*.[35] Klipp und klar wird hier schon am Anfang postuliert:

> Für die Annahme einer Differenzierung zwischen einer satt machenden Mahlzeit und den "eigentlichen" eucharistischen "Elementen" Brot und Wein bietet der Text nicht den mindesten Anhalt. Die Eucharistie ist ein Sättigungsmahl, und das Sättigungsmahl, bei dem diese Gebete gesprochen werden, ist eine Eucharistie. Der Ablauf ist klar angegeben: Bechersegen, Brotsegen, Mahlzeit (und zwar nach 9,5 und 10,3 das Essen vor dem Trinken), Nachtischgebet. Hier ist kein Raum frei, etwa für einen Einsetzungsbericht. Eine Kirchenordnung, die den Wortlaut des Vaterunsers bietet, hätte auch den Einsetzungsbericht des Abendmahls zitiert, wenn er in der Mahlfeier der Gemeinde eine Rolle gespielt hätte. Man darf nicht die neutestamentlichen Einsetzungsberichte zum Kriterium des Verstehens für den Did-Text machen. Und ebenfalls darf man nicht die Unterscheidung zwischen einem sättigenden Agape-Mahl und einem besonderen Kultmahl in 1 Kor. 11 hineinlesen. Auch die Didache kennt eine solche Unterscheidung nicht. Es handelt sich hier um eine einheitliche Mahlfeier, die als ganze "Eucharistie" genannt wird (45 f.).

Die Didachegebete sind nach Wengst—im Anschluss an M. Dibelius—hellenistisch-jüdische Gebete, die nur leicht verchristlicht worden sind, nämlich durch die Relativsätze in 9,2.3 und 10,2, durch die Erwähnung der Kirche in 9,4 und 10,5, durch die Schlussklausel "durch Jesus, deinen Knecht" in 10,3, und durch den ganzen Vers 10,6. Das Ergebnis lautet entsprechend:

> Das alles bedeutet: Die Eucharistie in der Didache ist nichts anderes als eine leicht verchristlichte jüdisch-hellenistische Mahlzeit, die von der Gemeinde am Sonntag gefeiert wird. Es liegt bei ihr also etwas völlig anderes vor als in der paulinischen und markinischen Tradition über das Herrenmahl. Für dieses ist ja der Bezug auf den Tod Jesu konstitutiv. Genau davon ist aber in den Anordnungen der Didache über die Eucharistie nicht das mindeste zu spüren. (53).[36]

Die Fragwürdigkeit der Wengst'schen These liegt m.E. hauptsächlich in der Schwierigkeit, seine aus der Didache rekonstruierte "Eucharistie"

historisch einzuordnen. Mit dem Herrenmahl der paulinischen und synoptischen Tradition soll sie in keiner Kontinuität stehen, aber woher kommt sie dann? Besteht Wengsts Vorschlag nicht einfach in der Erneuerung der alten Lietzmann'schen Postulierung zweier Typen von frühchristlichen Mahlfeiern, deren eine auf Jesu Tod Bezug nimmt und zur späteren Messfeier führt, deren andere auf die Fortführung der Mahlzeiten des irdischen Jesus zurückgeht, aber sehr bald verschwindet? Die Schwäche der Lietzmann'schen Konstruktion bestand aber doch gerade darin, dass die Didache als einziger Kronzeuge für die zweite Form des Herrenmahls herhalten musste, wobei Lietzmann obendrein wie Lothar Wehr den Text von Did. 10,6 an den Schluss von Kapitel 9 versetzte, um eine geschlossene Komposition zu erhalten.[37] Die unnüancierte, nur auf den Text der Didache konzentrierte Sicht Wengsts empfiehlt sich also nicht.

Die Behandlung der Frage durch *B. Kollmann*[38] liegt auf der Linie der Interpretation von Wengst, ist aber doch ein Stück nüancierter. Während Kollmann zwar mit Wengst übereinstimmt in der Annahme einer sehr oberflächlichen Christianisierung ursprünglich jüdisch-hellenistischer Gebete (80-89), setzt er sich doch gegenüber Wengst—vor allem aufgrund von Kap. 9,5 und 10,3—für eine Beurteilung der Eucharistie in Didache 9 f. als sakramentaler Gemeindefeier ein (92). In Auseinandersetzung mit L. Wehr bestreitet er aber wie Wengst jegliche sachliche Verwandtschaft mit der paulinisch-synoptischen Herrenmahlstradition (93 f.). Wie steht es dann mit Did. 10,6? Hat dieser Dialog nicht die Funktion einer Einleitung zur eucharistischen Kommunion? Auch in diesem Punkt gibt Kollmann zunächst zu, dass das vorpaulinische Traditionsstück 1. Kor. 16,20b.22 Analogien zur Didache aufweist, wobei er allerdings für den Maranatha-Ruf nur die futurische Deutung gelten lässt (bekanntlich übersetzt jedoch die koptische Version der Didache Maranatha perfektisch). Aber dann gelangt er zur überraschenden Folgerung, dass das "geradezu die Begehung zweier unmittelbar aufeinander folgender Mahlfeiern mit differierenden sakramentalen Inhalten spiegeln" würde, was ihm wenig plausibel erscheint (95). Da er damit rechnet, die Didache habe das Matthäusevangelium gekannt, muss er noch dem Einwand begegnen, dass es in diesem Fall verwunderlich sei, dass die matthäische Herrenmahlstradition in der Didache keinen Widerhall gefunden habe; er behilft sich mit der Auskunft, dass der Anamnesisbefehl sich dort nicht finde (95-97). Didache 10,6 sei also "im Horizont sachlich verwandter Vorstellungen aufgrund der eschatologischen Orientierung an 10,5 angefügt worden, ohne an dieser Stelle die Funktion einer mahleröffnenden liturgischen Tradition wahrzunehmen" (97).

Zunächst: Wie soll man die Sätze "wenn jemand heilig ist, *komme* er; wenn er es nicht ist, tue er Busse!" eschatologisch verstehen? Da wird doch eine konkrete versammelte Gemeinde angesprochen, hic et nunc etwas zu tun oder zu lassen. Weiter: Mir scheint bei Kollmann vor allem das Missverständnis vorzuliegen, dass er Did. 10,6—wenn man nicht wie er den Dialog als reine eschatologische Klausel interpretiert—nur als mahleröffnende liturgische Tradition verstehen kann. Wo steht im Text etwas von einem *Mahl*, das folgt? Das Mahl wurde ja schon vorher eingenommen (10,1). Folglich kann es sich hier nur um den Genuss der eucharistischen Elemente handeln. Und dafür wird vorausgesetzt, dass der Herzutretende sich auf seine Heiligkeit hin prüft, was in Did. 14-15 noch genauer präzisiert wird (das ist also nicht das Gleiche wie das Getauftsein, das in Did. 9,5 gefordert wird).[39] Darum kann ich den Schlussfolgerungen Kollmanns doch nicht zustimmen, obwohl ich anerkenne, dass er sich um eine sachlich-nüancierte Interpretation des Textes bemüht.

Ein amerikanischer Forscher, *John W. Riggs*, hat in zwei Artikeln eine radikale Sicht der Dinge vorgetragen.[40] Riggs kann sich auf eine Reihe von amerikanischen Neutestamentlern wie N. Perrin, B.L. Mack, J.D. Crossan—um nur sie zu nennen—berufen, um seine neue Sicht der Dinge in bezug auf die neutestamentliche Situation zu erhärten,[41] aber er ist der erste, der dieselbe textkritische Methode auf die Didache anwendet und so zu einer Freske der liturgischen Entwicklung der Kirche im 2. Jahrhundert vorstösst. Es ist das Einfachste, wenn ich die beiden Artikel Riggs' gemeinsam referiere; denn obwohl der zweite erst elf Jahre nach dem ersten veröffentlicht wurde, ist die Kontinuität der Anschauung zwischen beiden unverkennbar.

Neutestamentlich gesehen sieht es so aus: Jesus selber hat auf seinen Wanderungen Tischgemeinschaft gepflegt, bei der die rituellen Forderungen von rein und unrein durchbrochen wurden; die Tischgespräche standen in weisheitlicher Tradition. Nach Jesu Tod mengte sich in die weiterhin gepflegte Tischgemeinschaft die Erinnerung an Jesus, den Märtyrer für sein ehrwürdiges Anliegen. Diese vorpaulinische Tradition ist dann hauptsächlich von Markus mit der jüdischen Passahtradition verbunden worden. Auf diese Weise sind die Passionsgeschichten mit der Einsetzung des Abendmahls entstanden. In ihnen ist erstmals das Interesse an den eucharistischen Elementen Brot und Wein als heilige Speise zu finden. Wir stossen auf dieses Interesse auch in der Didache, aber nur in *einer* Redaktionsschicht ihrer Gebete, nämlich in Kapitel 9. Das Kapitel 10 ist noch ein Relikt aus der ersten Zeit der nachösterlichen Tischgemeinschaft.

Riggs unterscheidet im ganzen *drei Phasen* in der Redaktionsgeschichte von Did. 9-10:[42] 1. Das Nachtischgebet in Did. 10 ist "Urgestein." Es schliesst sich an die Tradition der eschatologischen Tischgemeinschaft Jesu an. Jesus selber wird noch nicht christologisch reflektiert. Die διά-Klauseln ("durch Jesus deinen Knecht") sind also später hinzugefügt. Es handelt sich aber nicht um ein verchristlichtes Birkat-ha-mazon-Gebet, sondern bereits um ein durch und durch christliches Gebet.[43] 2. Durch den zunehmenden zeitlichen Abstand bedingt wurde es nötig, auch Jesu selber zu gedenken. Das geschah durch die Hinzufügung des im Anklang an das jüdische Kiddusch- und 'Amida-Gebet formulierten Becher- und Brotsegens in Kapitel 9, sowie durch die nunmehr hinzugefügten διά-Klauseln in Kapitel 10. Ueberdies wurden jetzt die Gebete durch die liturgischen Anweisungen in Kap. 9,1,2 und 3 und 10,1 ergänzt. 3. Am einschneidendsten sind die Neuerungen in Phase 3. Denn jetzt stipuliert Did. 9,5, dass nur Getaufte an der Eucharistie teilnehmen dürfen, und 10,6 zeigt, dass zwischen Kap. 9 und 10 kein Mahl mehr gefeiert wird, sondern die Eucharistiekommunion erst folgt. Diesen ganzen redaktionsgeschichtlichen Ablauf stellt Riggs in Synopse mit der Entwicklung der neutestamentlichen Texte nach Willi Marxsen dar.

Im zweiten Artikel vergleicht Riggs dann diese redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Did. 9-10 mit dem, was sich aus ekklesiologisch-liturgischen Texten des 2. Jahrhunderts (vornehmlich Ignatius, Justin und Apostolische Tradition) erheben lässt und kommt zu folgendem Ergebnis: die Schlussredaktion der Didache ist um die Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts entstanden, da auch die Taufkatechese (für Riggs bedeutet sie eine Indoktrinierung, um die Bekehrten von ihrer Umgebung abzukapseln) und der Monepiskopat (für Riggs sind so autoritär-patriarchalische Bemerkungen wie Did. 9,5 und 10,6; cf. 14,1-2 eigentlich nur so zu verstehen) in der gleichen Zeit erstmals bezeugt sind.

Diese weitreichenden Folgerungen, die an der Didache aufgehängt werden, müssen zurückgewiesen werden. Es ist nicht meine Aufgabe, die neutestamentlichen Voraussetzungen, die ja Riggs seinerseits nur übernimmt, kritisch zu untersuchen.[44] Aber freilich brennt es mir auf den Nägeln, die redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse der Didachegebete, die Riggs gegeben hat, zu überprüfen. Ich formuliere meine Kritik in drei Anfragen: 1. Was soll der synoptische Vergleich zwischen Didache und paulinisch-markinischer Tradition? Dieser Vergleich erweckt den Anschein chronologischer Gleichzeitigkeit. Dabei ist ja nach Riggs die Endredaktion der Didache erst um die Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts entstanden. Darum ist es methodisch höchst

merkwürdig, dass Riggs sagen kann, seine Analyse der Didachegebete könne die Marxsen'sche Analyse der paulinisch-markinischen Texte stützen.[45] 2. Riggs macht gleich zu Beginn einen grundsätzlichen Fehler, wenn er annimmt, Kiddusch und Birkat-ha-mazon seien zwei jüdische Gebete, die nichts miteinander zu tun hätten beziehungsweise nicht während *eines* Mahles aufeinander folgen könnten, was ihn zu berechtigen scheint, Did. 9 und 10 auseinanderzureissen und auf zwei verschiedene Ursprünge zurückzuführen. Ein jüdisch-rituelles Mahl ist aber nur vollständig, wenn Becher- und Brotsegen vor dem Mahl und das Nachtischgebet nach dem Mahl gesprochen werden, was genau der *jetzigen* Anordnung der Didache entspricht und darum das entscheidende Argument für die Einheitlichkeit der beiden Kapitel 9-10 ist. 3. Verfehlt ist auch die Analyse Riggs von Did. 9,5 und 10,6. Er übersieht, dass die Ausschliessung unerwünschter Personen ihre Wurzeln schon in der jüdischen Tradition hat. Und er glaubt, Did. 10,6 impliziere, dass das Sättigungsmahl in der 3. Phase der Redaktionsgeschichte der Didache bereits unterdrückt war, obwohl Did. 10,1 ausdrücklich darauf anspielt. Man darf doch diesen Text nicht von der späteren Paraphrasierung der Apostolischen Konstitutionen her lesen!

Wenn die redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse Riggs nicht stichhaltig ist, dann ist natürlich auch seine Spätdatierung der Didache in die Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts hinfällig. Was die Mahlgebete der Didache insbesondere angeht, bin ich nach wie vor der Ansicht, dass sie ins 1. Jahrhundert zurückreichen. Ob wir noch näher präzisieren können, ist fraglich. Zur Frühdatierung E. Mazzas habe ich schon oben Stellung genommen.[46]

Summa summarum: Ich glaube berechtigt zu sein, auch heute noch an meiner vor 20 Jahren vorgeführten Deutung der Didachegebete in Kapitel 9-10 festhalten zu dürfen. In der Didache wird uns in einzigartiger Weise die Uebergangsphase greifbar, wie sich die christliche Herrenmahlfeier langsam aus ihrem von der jüdischen Tradition vorgegebenen Rahmen herauslöst und zur Eucharistie wird. Das Sättigungsmahl (eben das Herren*mahl*) wird noch gefeiert, und darum werden die Gebete nach jüdischem Muster vor (Did. 9) und nach (Kap. 10) dem Mahl gesprochen; ihr Inhalt lehnt sich auch deutlich an die jüdische Vorlage an. Es ist aber ebenso stark christlich geprägt (vom *Herren*mahl). Man kann wohl ohne Uebertreibung sagen, dass vor allem Kapitel 10 schon die Züge einer Praefatio trägt. Damit ist allerdings auch gesagt, dass die eigentliche Eucharistiefeier erst nach Did. 10,6 folgt, worauf ja auch der Inhalt dieses Verses unmissverständlich anspielt ("Wer heilig ist, der soll *herkommen*!").

Wir wissen freilich nicht, wie die fehlende Fortsetzung aussah. Wir wissen nicht einmal, warum sie fehlt. Ich gebe zu, dass der Hinweis auf die Arkandisziplin nicht richtig befriedigt.[47] Wurde hier der Einsetzungsbericht rezitiert? Was mich betrifft, würde ich nicht das entscheidende Gewicht auf diese Frage legen. Das ist eine anachronistische Fragestellung. Auf jeden Fall wurde ein deutlicherer Bezug auf Jesu letztes Mahl hergestellt, als dies in den überlieferten Gebeten der Kapitel 9-10 der Fall ist. Das wird auch nahegelegt durch das Kapitel 14, das die Frage von Beichte und Versöhnung im Zusammenhang mit dem eucharistischen Mahl behandelt.[48] Hier wird die Feier als "Brotbrechen" bezeichnet, was in dieser frühen Zeit noch deutlicher als der Ausdruck "Eucharistie" auf die Herrenmahlfeier bezogen ist.[49] Desgleichen erscheint hier der Terminus "Opfer" für die Herrenmahlfeier. Wenngleich "Opfer" aus Malachia 1,11 entlehnt ist und darum das Lippenopfer meint, so ist dieser Ausdruck doch schwerlich als Bezeichnung für eine blosse Mahlfeier verständlich; sie muss sich irgendwie auf die christliche Zentralfeier beziehen, die das alttestamentliche Opfer abgelöst hat. Es ist auch zu beachten, dass im Kapitel 14 wieder die "Reinheit" der Teilnehmer am Mahl eine wichtige Rolle spielt, die doch auch am Ende von Kapitel 10 so stark in den Vordergrund gestellt wurde.

Im übrigen ist es müssig, über die konkrete Gestalt der Eucharistiefeier zwischen Did. 10,6 und 10,7 zu spekulieren. Minimal gesehen muss es darum gegangen sein, dass die "hinzutretenden" getauften Christen die Kommunion (vielleicht die Did. 9,2-3 schon konsekrierten Gaben?) empfingen, wobei ihnen die Beziehung zum Abschiedsmahl Jesu irgendwie in Erinnerung gerufen wurde; maximal gesehen kann man sich vorstellen, dass hier auch die Rezitation des Einsetzungsberichts ihren Platz hatte (wobei es dann aber merkwürdig bleibt, dass die Didache ihn nicht erwähnt). Ich persönlich denke, dass man auch das Herrngebet (das ja nach Did. 8,3 dreimal am Tag gebetet wurde) in diesem Zusammenhang sprach und sich den geschwisterlichen Kuss gab (vgl. 1. Kor. 16,20!), der die Vergebungsbereitschaft, wie sie die Didache (4,14; 10,6; 14,1-2) fordert, zum Ausdruck bringt.[50]

Natürlich—das ist ja erneut deutlich geworden—muss auch ich in dieser letzten Frage mit einem argumentum e silentio arbeiten, aber diese Sicht der Dinge scheint mir befriedigender als die andern Lösungsvorschläge, die wir erwähnt haben. Sie ergibt sich ungezwungen aus dem vorliegenden griechischen Text der Didache und lässt sich ebenso ungezwungen in das Bild, das wir von der Gesamtentwicklung der Herrenmahlfeier in der christlichen Frühzeit haben, einordnen.

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] "L'Eucharistie des premiers chrétiens: la Didachè," in: L'Eucharistie des premiers chrétiens (Le point théologique 17), Paris 1976, 7-28 (wieder abgedruckt in: Liturgie, foi et vie des premiers chrétiens. Etudes patristiques, 2. Aufl. Paris 1988, 187-208).

[2] *Didachè (Doctrine des douze Apôtres)* (SC 248), Paris 1978.

[3] Siehe dazu jetzt die sehr sorgfältige Edition und Untersuchung von F.S. Jones und P.A. Mirecki, "Considerations on the Coptic Papyrus of the *Didache* (British Library Oriental Manuscript 9271)," in The *Didache* in Context. Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 77), Leiden 1995, 47-87.

[4] Auch André Tuilier und ich haben sie übernommen: *op. cit.* (Anm. 2), 113.

[5] B. Layton, Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired Since the Year 1906, London 1987, 236.

[6] "A Note on *Didache* 12.2a (Coptic)," The Second Century 7, 1989-90, 65-75.

[7] "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wanderradikalismus im Traditionsbereich der Didache," Wiener Studien 11, 1977, 148-150; vgl. *idem*, Die Didache (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 1), Göttingen 1989, 209-233.

[8] "*Didache* 11-13: The Legacy of Radical Itinerancy in Early Christianity," in: The *Didache* in Context (Anm. 3 oben), Leiden 1995, 312-329.

[9] Fügen wir nur zur Information an, dass K. Niederwimmer, "Der Didachist und seine Quellen," in: The *Didache* in Context (Anm. 3 oben), 19, Anm. 16, sich zu der in Diskussion stehenden These wie folgt geäussert hat: "Jefford und Patterson (1989-90) haben die These vertreten, dass eine Frühform der *Didache* mit 12,2a geschlossen habe, wie jetzt noch Copt. zeigt. Sie berufen sich bei dieser Hypothese u.a. auch auf die von mir erörterte Inkonzinnität zwischen c. 11 (Apostel und Propheten) und c. 13 (Propheten und Lehrer). Aber kann 12,2a wirklich das ursprüngliche Ende unserer Schrift sein? Die Fortsetzung in H (= codex Hierosolymitanus) ist in sich logisch und wirkt nicht wie eine nachträgliche Erfindung. Die Diskrepanz zwischen c. 11 und c. 13 erklärt sich m.E. aus der Entstehungsgeschichte der *Didache*."

[10] *Art. cit.*, 71-74.

[11] Er ist allerdings koptisch nicht erhalten; Jefford und Patterson zweifeln aber nicht daran, dass er sich auch im koptischen Text so gefunden hat.

[12] "From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of Didache 9 and 10," The Second Century 4, 1984, 83-101, speziell 88-91; Jefford und Patterson, *art. cit.*, 74, Anm. 25, verweisen auf ihn.

[13] Riggs sagt selber zu dieser Uebersetzung: "g is a manuscript whose late date, completeness, and location in one of the Eastern centers of Christianity make it more likely to be associated with the late complete manuscript H than to be classified as a witness completely independent of H." (88).

[14] Merkwürdigerweise erwähnt Riggs nicht einmal die koptische Variante "durch *Jesus* deinen Knecht," die auch André Tuilier und ich vorgezogen haben.

[15] Dasselbe ist zu bemerken hinsichtlich der dreimaligen Einfügung eines "Amen" in der koptischen Uebersetzung (10,4.5.6).

[16] In: The *Didache* in Context (Anm. 3 oben), 47-87.

[17] Siehe K. Niederwimmer, in: The *Didache* in Context, 19, Anm. 16 (zitiert in Anm. 9 oben).

[18] Dafür würden die Füllstriche am Ende der 1. Kolumne sprechen.

[19] La Doctrine des douze Apôtres, 180, Anm. 2.

[20] *Op. cit.*, 182, Anm. 1.

[21] So jetzt auch K. Wengst, Didache (Apostellehre) Barnabasbrief Zweiter Klemensbrief Schrift an Diognet (Schriften des Urchristentums II), 83, Anm. 88, G. Schöllgen, Didache. Zwölf-Apostel-Lehre (Fontes Christiani 1), Freiburg 1991, 125, Anm. 112, und K. Niederwimmer, *op. cit.* (Anm. 7 oben), 42, welcher zwar auch die Authentizität von περὶ πάντων (koptisch) gegen πρὸ πάντων (griechisch) und die koptische Hinzufügung von πρὸς ἡμᾶς in Did. 12,1 verteidigt, was uns (noch) nicht überzeugt.

[22] *Op. cit.*, 205-209. Daran ändert auch die Zustimmung zu Wengst von B. Kollmann, Ursprung und Gestalten der frühchristlichen Mahlfeier, Göttingen 1990, 89-91, nichts.

[23] Didache, 82, dazu 57-59.

[24] "The So-called Ointment Prayer in the Coptic Version of the Didache: A Re-evaluation," Harvard Theol. Review 70, 1977, 67-84.

[25] *Op. cit.* (Anm. 21 oben), 173-205.

[26] *Op. cit.* (Anm. 21 oben), 50-54.

[27] Siehe auch den Handbuchartikel von H.B. Meyer, Eucharistie. Geschichte, Theologie, Pastorale (Gottesdienst der Kirche 4), Regensburg 1989, 91-94.—Es verdient hervorgehoben zu werden, dass T.J. Talley, "From *Berakah* to *Eucharistia*: A Reopening Question," Worship 50, 1976, 115-137 (vgl. *idem*, "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research: Results and Reflections," Studia Liturgica 11, 1976, 138-158, und "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer," Worship 58, 1984, 404-420) weiterführende Studien zum jüdischen Hintergrund der Didachegebete gemacht hat. Er weist nach, dass die Struktur der Birkat ha-mazon: Segen/berakah—Danksagung—Bitte im Didachegebet von Kap. 10 zur Folge: Lobpreis/eucharistia—Danksagung—Bitte gewechselt hat.

[28] "Didache IX-X: Elementi per una interpretazione eucaristica," Ephemerides liturgicae 92, 1978, 393-419; cf. *idem*, The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer, Collegeville/Minnesota, 1995.

[29] Für J.H. Walker, "A pre-Marcan Dating for the Didache: Further Thoughts of a Liturgist," in: Papers on the Gospels: Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies, Oxford 3-7 April 1978 (JSNTSup 3 = Studia Biblica 3), Sheffield 1980, 403-411, ist das Fehlen des Einsetzungsberichtes das Zeichen eines vorpaulinischen Ursprungs der Gebete von Didache 9-10. B. Salvarini, "L'Eucaristia di Didachè IX-X alla luce della Teologia giovannea: un' ipotesi," Rivista Biblica 34 (1986), 369-390, postuliert seinerseits, das Johannesevangelium sei von Did. 9-10 beeinflusst.

[30] Der Kuriosität halber kann ich hier noch den sehr dezidierten Versuch von S. Dockx, "Date et Origine de la Doctrine des Apôtres aux Gentils," in: Chronologies néotestamentaires et Vie de l'Eglise primitive. Recherches exégétiques, Leuven 1984, 363-392, erwähnen, die Didache (die allerdings ursprünglich nur die Kapitel 7,1; 8,2-3; 9,1-4; 10,1-3.5-7; 14,1.3; 15,1 enthalten hätte) auf das Apostelkonzil vom Jahre 48 zurückzuführen. Er bemerkt dazu: "Il suffit de lire ce texte, dégagé de ses surcharges multiples et restauré seulement à quelques endroits, pour se rendre compte de sa parfaite symétrie, tel qu'il convient à un texte liturgique de prières à réciter ensemble" (382). Diese "perfekte Symmetrie" kam aber zustande aufgrund einer willkürlichen Quellenscheidung des Verfassers. Er sagt selber am Schluss seines Artikels: "Ceci ne dit pas que notre hypothèse soit définitivement prouvée, mais elle mérite sérieuse considération" (392).

[31] "'Was unterscheidet diese Nacht von allen andern Nächten?' Die Funktion des Stiftungsberichtes in der urchristlichen Eucharistiefeier nach Didache 9 f. und dem Zeugnis Justins," Jahrb. für Liturgie und Hymnologie 27, 1993, 1-15.

[32] Neutestamentl. Abhandlungen, N.F. 18, Münster 1987.

[33] Siehe schon H. Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl, Berlin, 3. Aufl. 1955, 236-238.

[34] "Die 'Eucharistie' der Didache," Ephemerides Liturgicae 101, 1987, 3-32.

[35] Didache (Apostellehre) Barnabasbrief Zweiter Klemensbrief Schrift an Diognet (Schriften des Urchristentums II), Darmstadt 1984, 43-57.

[36] Lothar Wehr hat sich in seiner Monographie (*op. cit.*, 342-344) mit der Deutung Wengsts auseinandergesetzt. Dieser hat ihm darauf einen längeren Brief geschrieben, den Wehr im Anhang seines Buches zusammenfasst und kritisch würdigt (376-377). Beide Autoren beharren aber im wesentlichen auf ihrem schon vorher eingenommenen Standpunkt.

[37] A propos: Die letzte Widerlegung von Lietzmanns These der zwei ursprünglichen Mahlfeiertypen ist im "Anhang" (er umfasst die Seiten 217-697!) zur englischen Uebersetzung von Lietzmanns Buch "Mass and Lord's Supper" (Leiden 1979) von R.D. Richardson versucht worden. Was aber Richardson zu den Gebeten von Did. 9-10 sagt (sie seien eine "Auslegung" des Vater-Unsers), kann leider nicht überzeugen. Da stimme ich viel lieber E. Mazza, "Omelie pasquali e Birkat ha-mazon; fonti dell'Anafora di Ippolito?," Ephemerides Liturgicae 97 (1983), 409-481, zu, der eine gemeinsame Grundstruktur zwischen Did. 10 und der Hippolyt-Anafora herausstellt, wobei er die Unterschiede zwischen beiden auf eine "Paschalisierung" der letzteren zurückführt.

[38] Ursprung und Gestalten der frühchristlichen Mahlfeier (Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten 43), Göttingen 1990, 79-101.

[39] Vgl. zur ganzen Frage W. Rordorf, "La rémission des péchés selon la Didachè," in: Liturgie, foi et vie des premiers chrétiens, Paris, 2. Aufl. 1988, 209-223.

[40] I: "From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of Didache 9 and 10," The Second Century 4, 1984, 83-101 (diesen Artikel haben wir oben Anm. 10 schon zitiert), und II: "The Sacred Food of *Didache* 9-10 and Second-Century Ecclesiologies," in: The *Didache* in Context, 256-283.

[41] W. Marxsens ins Englische übersetztes Buch "The Lord's Supper as a Christological Problem," Philadelphia 1970, hat offenbar diese Neutestamentler sehr beeinflusst. Im gleichen Fahrwasser bewegt sich nun B. Kollmann, Ursprung und Gestalten der frühchristlichen Mahlfeier, Göttingen 1990 (Zusammenfassung des Ergebnisses: 251-258). Aber seine sachliche Arbeit wird den Texten viel gerechter als die etwas vierschrötige Methode der amerikanischen "Bahnbrecher."

[42] Es ist wohl das Beste, wenn ich hier sein Schema (I, 100) wiederhole:

D 9 and 10	*1 Cor. 11:23-5; Mk. 14:22-4*
STAGE I	
Christianized *berakah* without Christological references (D 10.2-5)	
Eschatological table sharing that continues Jesus' witness	
	pre-Pauline
	Bread and cup sayings with Christological references at beginning and end of meal

	No explicit reference to eating the bread or drinking the cup
	Bread broken and cup shared
STAGE II	*Paul*
Christological cup and bread prayers placed together and start meal (D 9.2-4)	Christological bread and cup sayings placed together and end meal
Thanksgiving prayer after the meal (D 10.2-5 with διά-phrases added)	Meal still retained
Instructions in 9.1,2,3; 10.1	Paul makes explicit partaking the bread and cup within context of love
STAGE III	*Mark*
Bread and cup prayers, and Thanksgiving prayer prior to cultic event	Bread and wine sayings from cultic event stand together
Table is fenced, elements are sacred, eat-drink order (9.5)	Elements themselves are sacramental
Eucharist to follow (10,6)	Eucharist without meal

[43] Für diesen Punkt kann sich Riggs auf die Strukturanalysen von Th. I. Talley (vgl. die in Anm. 27 oben zitierten Artikel) berufen.

[44] Siehe etwa das Buch von E. Schweizer, Jesus—das Gleichnis Gottes, Göttingen 1995.

[45] *Art. cit.*, I, 101.

[46] Anm. 22. Die essenisch-qumranischen "Parallelen" zu den Mahlgebeten der Didache sind—im Gegensatz zum Duae viae—zu unpräzis, als dass sie für die Datierungsfrage etwas hergäben. Zum essenisch-qumranischen "Hintergrund" siehe J.A. Draper, A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrols and Related Documents (Dissertation Cambridge 1983, 181-228, und A. Tuilier, "La liturgie dans la *Didachè* et l'essénisme," Studia Patristica XXVI, Leuven 1993, 200-210.

[47] Vgl. etwa B. Kollmann, *op. cit.*, 96 f.

[48] So richtig K. Niederwimmer, Die Didache, 234-240.

[49] Literatur bei K. Niederwimmer, ebenda, 235 f., Anm. 10.

[50] Vgl. W. Rordorf, "Wie auch wir vergeben *haben* unsern Schuldnern (Matth. VI, 12b)," in: Studia Patristica X (TU 107), Berlin 1970, 336-341; *idem*, "La rémission des péchés selon la Didachè," in: Liturgie, foi et vie des premiers chrétiens, Paris-Neuchâtel, 2. Aufl. 1988, 209-223.

* Dieser Artikel erschien bereits in italienischer Sprache: "Le preghiere della cena in *Didachè* 9-10: un nuovo 'status quaestionis,'" in: *Liturgia ed evangelizzazione nell'epoca dei Padri e nella Chiesa del Vaticano II. Studi in onore di Enzo Lodi*, Bologna 1996, 55-76.

CHRIST'S BIRTH OF A VIRGIN WHO BECAME A WIFE: FLESH AND SPEECH IN TERTULLIAN'S *DE CARNE CHRISTI*

BY

WILLEMIEN OTTEN

This article explores the powerful efficacy of Tertullian's theological discourse in his treatise *De carne Christi*. Departing from the conventional wisdom of evaluating early Christian theological texts according to their adherence to formal rhetorical models, which makes them vulnerable to postmodern criticism, this article advocates an alternative approach. It analyzes Tertullian's arguments by relating them directly to his central topic of discussion: the flesh of Christ. Tertullian's insistence on the physical concreteness of Christ's flesh, which connects Christ's human birth inseparably with his death and resurrection, serves to underscore what he calls "the law for our resurrection" (ch. 1).

The article demonstrates that the physical concreteness of Christ's flesh so dominates Tertullian's theological discourse that it underlies even his well-known use of paradox. An example is found when Tertullian makes the truth of Christ's resurrection following his crucifixion dependent on how it mocks wordly wisdom (ch. 5). The article reveals specifically how a view of Tertullian's discourse as pivoting on the concreteness of Christ's flesh sheds light on his arguments regarding Christ's birth of a virgin (chs. 17-23). For Tertullian, Christ's flesh can only lay down the law for humanity's bodily resurrection if the divine Word heeds the "law of the opened body" (ch. 23) by undergoing a fully human birth. In his logic Christ's exit into this world, which opened his mother's womb, caused Mary to change from virgin to wife. Since Christ's birth is thus itself a *signum contradicibile*, Tertullian's discourse is stripped of its former dependence on paradoxes to describe its salvific novelty, gaining a new-found accuracy instead.

Introduction: Tertullian's De Carne Christi, *Rhetoric or Theology?*

It has been a longstanding tradition in biblical and patristic scholarship to evaluate the theological purport of its studied texts by means of rhetorical analysis, i.e., an analysis based upon the models of classical rhetoric. In the Enlightenment paradigm of modern academia, rhetorical analysis seems to safeguard objectivity, at the point where the religious spectrum of theological practitioners might formerly have given rise to unmitigated confessionalism. But does that imply that rhetorical analysis itself is devoid of theological baggage?

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

A case in point is the role of the virgin in Tertullian's *De carne Christi* chs. 17-23, in which the author seems to advocate a rather low Mariology, if not Christology.[1] In his defense of the Incarnation against Marcionite attacks, Tertullian is eager to stress the humanity of Christ's flesh. To this end he gives a most graphic description of Christ's human birth, bringing out its special significance by underlining how he took flesh from a virgin. Yet his position becomes controversial by later theological standards when he argues that, while Mary undoubtedly conceived as a virgin, she became a married woman in childbirth, because her womb was opened when Christ made his exit into the world.

When surveying the modern debate regarding the rhetorical structure of the *De carne Christi*, it is clear that the complex theological problems evoked by Tertullian's defense of Christ's human flesh have left their imprint on the discussion, especially where Mary's transition from virgin to married woman is concerned. Let us look at three examples. In his edition of the *De carne Christi* (1956) Ernest Evans treats this work as a so-called *suasoria*: a speech to be delivered in court against an adversary present and himself open to the attack. He divides Tertullian's treatise into five formal parts. The first of these is the *exordium* (ch. 1) which states the main question. It is followed by the second part which comprises both *narratio* and *partitio*, as they appear closely linked here (chs. 2-16). In this second part Tertullian states the case of each of his opponents (Marcion, Apelles and the Valentinians) only to reject each position immediately. Evans sees the so-called *confirmatio* and *reprehensio*, Tertullian's exposition of his opponents' position followed by an immediate rebuttal, as so inextricably bound to *partitio* here that they are subsumed under it rather than forming a separate third part. He relegates the controversial chs. 17-23 about Christ's birth from Mary who transformed from a virgin into a married woman to the marginal role of *amplificatio*, the fourth part. The final chs. 24-25 form the usual *peroratio*, the fifth part.[2]

Robert Sider has criticized Evans' rhetorical analysis of *De carne Christi* precisely on his treatment of chapters 17-23 concerning the virgin in his excellent *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (1971). Unlike Evans, who saw them as mere *amplificatio*, Sider considers these chapters of crucial importance in Tertullian's defense of Christ's human flesh. He argues that Tertullian shows himself master rather than slave of rhetorical form by applying what is in fact a daring new rhetorical strategy here. Sider sees Tertullian inverting the traditional Ciceronian order by making *confirmatio* follow *refutatio*. After engaging in the formal refutation of his heretical oppo-

nents Marcion, Apelles and the Valentinians in chs. 2-16 (*refutatio*), it is not until ch. 17 that Tertullian gives the positive proof for his position (*confirmatio*). This occurs when he connects Christ's Incarnation with his taking flesh from a virgin.[3]

Sider's point about the inverted sequence of confirmation and refutation, although attractive inasmuch as it rehabilitates the controversial chs. 17-23, remains a tenuous one at best. In his edition of *De carne Christi* (1975), Jean-Pierre Mahé has criticized Sider's analysis, as he cautions against overstating the distance between *confirmatio* and *refutatio*.[4] This caveat may be especially relevant in the case of a polemical treatise like *De carne Christi*, where the confirmation of the author's position depends in large part on the adequate rebuttal of his opponents.[5] Struggling to give ch. 23 on Mary as virgin and wife a satisfactory place in his own rhetorical analysis,[6] however, Mahé does not hesitate to dismiss this chapter summarily as Tertullian's misguided response to Valentinian attacks. Since the Valentinians were expected to jump on the contradiction between Mary as virgin and mother, i.e., non-virgin, Mahé sees Tertullian's interpretation as providing an explanation of how Mary could indeed be both virgin and wife. But in Mahé's opinion, Tertullian loses his sound judgment when he claims that Mary became a wife by losing her virginity *in partu*.[7]

As can be glanced from this debate concerning the rhetorical structure of Tertullian's *De carne Christi*, modern authors tend to either overstate or downplay the importance of chs. 17-23, no doubt because of their charged content in light of later confessional developments. The attempt to settle what is at heart a theological matter, i.e., how to judge the relative importance of Christ's taking flesh from a virgin for Tertullian's overall defense of Christ's humanity, through the formal models of classical rhetoric appears to set ever new contradictions in motion. But more is at stake than the uninviting prospect of a debate that may never reach closure. In the current tide of postmodern studies the art of rhetorical analysis itself has grown increasingly complex, thereby losing its former suitability as an instrument of adjudication in the hands of theologians and/or philosophers. First, the position of the detached, objective narrator has crumbled under the weight of ever new theories which present the text as an amorphous and largely autonomous edifice over which the author and his audience exercise only marginal control. Second, with the disappearance of the idea of *e mente auctoris* as providing scholars with the clear aim of rhetorical analysis, the rhetorical enterprise threatens to become not just obsolete but even suspect. After all, if we cannot touch on what the author had to say, let

alone what he had in mind in saying it, the point of studying his texts becomes increasingly unclear.[8]

It is in the absence of a clear formulation of what early Christian texts have to offer to an audience with present-day concerns that they can become easy targets for well-aiming cultural critics. One of the fiercest objections that postmodern critics have levelled against the historical culture of the West is that it displays an unabashedly logocentric character,[9] as it emphasizes spirit over body and word over flesh.[10] As a consequence, early Christian texts are frequently characterized as remnants of a past whose collective indictment leaves them little immediate relevance, either rhetorically or theologically. One may even wonder whether they should be studied at all.[11]

And yet Tertullian always hits a nerve. This was true for his second century audience but still seems applicable today. In the novel *Roger's Version* (1986) by the American author John Updike, it is Tertullian who speaks most keenly to the predicament of its main character, the Harvard Divinity School professor Roger Lambert, a specialist in the works of Karl Barth. Lambert's midlife crisis and academic conceit have left him helpless before the raw beauty of his wife's streetsmart niece Verna, as he ponders but never actually engages in an affair with her. Confronted with the messiness of his late twentieth century "condition humaine," in which sexuality, boredom, middle age and fear of death all converge, Professor Lambert finds himself quoting numerous passages from Tertullian, including from the latter's treatise *De carne Christi*.[12] The apparent reason why Roger Lambert harks back to Tertullian's early Christian treatises in this novel is that he teaches a course on Pelagianism, in which gnosticism and Manicheism all play a part. Given Lambert's difficulties in reintegrating his outwardly successful but inwardly eroded life, however, the underlying reason why he turns to Tertullian rather than Barth may well be that the former is a shrewder judge of human character than his famed twentieth century successor.

For Roger Lambert, Tertullian speaks so keenly to his predicament because he lays bare the sheer centrality of the human flesh in all human experience, be it the physical experiences of birth or death or spiritual ones, like learning and speech. The latter point brings me to the thesis of this essay. In dealing with Tertullian's puzzling and theologically charged chapters about the virgin, why do we not let the text speak to us directly, rather than imposing yet another rhetorical structure on it? Instead of distinguishing between rhetoric and theology, as if suggesting a separation

between form and content, perhaps we should deliberately sidestep any artificial division between them and simply ask: what does human flesh have to do with human speech? Or, to put it in the concrete context of *De carne Christi*, how does the theological topic of Tertullian's treatise, the flesh of Christ, affect his own rhetoric, i.e., his own mode of speech?

A. *Flesh and Speech in* De Carne Christi: *Chs. 2-5 on the Truth of Christ's Flesh*

Let us now go back to the treatise to see how Tertullian sets his agenda. The problem of humanity's resurrection, namely whether humanity awaits a bodily resurrection, appears to have lent urgency to Tertullian's plan to launch an overall defense of Christ's flesh. Christ's spiritual substance being free from controversy, only his corporeal substance stands in need of further proof. It has been under attack from numerous heretical groups. Putting forth an unbreakable connection between Christ's Incarnation and his Resurrection, Tertullian contends that only an endorsement of the real, human flesh of Christ can lay down the law for our human resurrection (. . . *dabit legem nostrae resurrectioni*), which will accordingly be a bodily one.[13] He thus states the central problem of his treatise as follows:

> It is Christ's flesh that is under scrutiny. Its truth and its quality are under discussion—whether it existed, and whence it came and of what sort it was.[14]

Although the *ueritas* of Christ's flesh is the central theme in the entire discourse from chs. 2 to 16, I shall here focus on chs. 2-5 where Tertullian counters the views of his prime opponent, Marcion. While he dismisses Marcion's arguments as illogical and his exegesis of scriptural passages as not in conformity with their context, his main objection against Marcion is that he has abandoned the tradition of the Church. Here a first connection between flesh and speech surfaces, as for Tertullian the truth of Christ's flesh (i.e., its real humanity) appears rooted in the truth as it has been handed down by tradition (i.e., the text of Scripture as received by the Church and continued in its preaching). Since Marcion has abandoned the words of the tradition, he has surrendered himself to lies and false appearances. Thus, he can no longer lay claim on the truth.[15]

Having refuted many of Marcion's reasons for not believing in Christ's Incarnation—that it was *inconueniens, impossibilis*, or *indignus* for God—, Tertullian raises the issue of Christ's nativity in ch. 4. Contrary to Marcion, he sees the shamefulness of Christ's birth not as un-Godlike but, instead,

as a sign of his love for humans and his will to redeem them.[16] For Tertullian, God's love for humans as humans cannot but be a love that is wholesale. It naturally includes love for their human birth. Using the Pauline contrast between divine *stultitia* and wordly *sapientia* found in 1 Cor. 1:27, Tertullian argues that by opting to become human himself the Son of God selected a foolish, i.e., conspicuously undivine, way to carry out his redemption of humanity. Becoming human entailed the need to be born with a carnal body. Adding to the foolishness of this redemptive act, moreover, Christ chose to be born of a virgin.

In ch. 5 the discussion about the truth of Christ's flesh, i.e., its concrete humanity, reaches a climax, as he poignantly extends the *stultitia*-theme to apply not just to Christ's humiliation through his human birth but also to his death by crucifixion. Using the term *ueritas* as a double-edged sword, Tertullian contrasts the truth of Christ's flesh first with the *falsitas* of which Marcion implicitly accuses scriptural authors like St. Paul when he denies the truth of their words about the crucifixion. If Christ was not truly crucified, then Paul must have fraudulently stated that he knew nothing other than Jesus crucified.[17] Given that Tertullian had already identified truth and tradition in the previous chapters, however, Marcion's crime here ranges beyond intellectual dishonesty. By falsifying the words of the tradition, it appears Marcion effectively denies the truth of the essential message it brings to the Christian community: the promise of salvation. Using *ueritas* now in light of the biblical message of redemption as accomplished by Christ's physical humiliation on the cross and his subsequent resurrection, a resurrection which forebodes ours, Tertullian anchors the truth of Christ's flesh in the following series of staggering paradoxes:

> The Son of God was crucified: I am not ashamed—because it is shameful;
> The Son of God died: it is immediately credible—because it is silly;
> He was buried and rose again: it is certain—because it is impossible.[18]

Since for Tertullian confounding worldly wisdom has become a precondition for establishing divine truth, the faith of the Christian community hinges on its trusting acceptance of such worldly paradoxes. Accepting the shame of Christ's crucifixion, accepting the ineptitude of his death will inevitably lead one from overcoming shame to embracing the certitude of that which is impossible in the eyes of the world: the resurrection of him who was buried. Yet Christian *stultitia* did not start with the crucifixion. As Tertullian had already made clear in ch. 4, the first clear manifestation of divine *stultitia* was the fact of Christ's human birth, as he took flesh

from a virgin. Within the context of salvation history, however, Christ's birth of a virgin gains even more importance here in ch. 5, to the extent that it both adumbrates and guarantees the truth of his resurrection. Thus Tertullian appears to put forth the position that Christ's birth and his resurrection belong to a single development, be it a discontinuous one, as is underscored by his use of paradoxical language. To highlight that the development from Christ's birth to his crucifixion and resurrection pertains nevertheless to the person of a single Redeemer, Tertullian emphatically stresses the verity of Christ's two natures.[19] In his view, only when Christ's flesh is truly human can his spirit be truly divine—and hence, the resurrection made possible.

Tertullian ends ch. 5 with a last appeal to Marcion: "Why make out that Christ was half a lie? He was wholly the truth."[20] This statement directs us a final time to the connection of flesh and speech. For Tertullian, Christ's flesh, which remains his implicit topic of discussion here, is true not just because the words of the tradition which narrate his life from birth to resurrection refer to actual events,[21] but ultimately because Christ, who is himself the truth, inhabits and embodies these very words.[22] The fact that Christ himself embodies the truth of the tradition is what ultimately makes Tertullian bold enough to state that Scripture's promise of salvation is undeniably true. If humanity is to share in this salvation, however, only a humanly born Christ can serve as the acclaimed *pontifex salutis*, which is a far cry from the *artifex spectaculi* represented by Marcion's fraudulent Christ.[23]

In sum, Tertullian's defense of the verity of Christ's flesh centers around his ability to perceive an alliance between the truth of the tradition (i.e., the words of scripture as received by the Church and continued in its preaching), the truth of the message proclaimed by that tradition (i.e. the promise of salvation as evidenced by the redemptive course of Christ's life from lowly birth to triumphant resurrection) and the truth of Christ himself (the divine Word, who embodies these words and who guarantees humanity's salvation). In sealing this triple alliance as an indissoluble one, Tertullian has ensconced the truth of Christ's flesh safely beneath a flurry of arguments designed to disorient Marcion rather than answer his criticisms. Leaping from the unchangeable text of Scripture to his own language of paradox, he so entangles his opponent that accepting the verity of Christ's flesh remains the only alternative left.

B. *Flesh and speech in* De Carne Christi: *Chs. 17-23 on the Quality of Christ's Flesh*

Having solved this first question surrounding Christ's flesh, i.e., its verity, Tertullian next turns his inquiry to its quality. As he states in ch. 17:

> . . . let us now carry out our attack on one single front: whether Christ took flesh from a virgin, for by this method, if by no other, it will be established that his flesh was human, if it derived its substance from a human womb.[24]

After Tertullian has painstakingly rebutted his other opponents, Apelles and the Valentinians, he next turns to the defense of Christ's birth of a virgin. From the above quotation, it would appear that by stating how Christ took flesh from a virgin Tertullian intends merely to underscore the latter's humanity. Yet a continued reading of ch. 17 reveals that Christ's humanity may not be what is really at stake, for earlier chapters have already proved this point.[25] Thus the question why Tertullian wants to crush his opponents' views by accenting the role of the virgin becomes a more pressing one. He answers it with a striking play of words. As he sets out to explain, Christ's birth of a virgin (*nativitas*) does not just underscore his humanity, which had already been established, but depicts what is in fact a complete theological novelty (*novitas*), namely that by virtue of Christ's physical birth of a virgin, humanity will experience a spiritual birth in God.[26]

Tertullian explains how Christ's birth of a virgin is a new sign, as he takes flesh from a virgin without human seed. But, as he does not fail to point out, while the sign itself is new, it has been prefigured of old, as can be demonstrated from the prophecy in Is. 7:14: *Ecce uirgo concipiet in utero et pariet filium.* By giving a series of figurative examples linking the old and the new Tertullian effectively roots the quality of Christ's flesh, i.e., his birth of a virgin, in the underlying truth of the tradition. For it is only when the true relationship between the Old and the New Testaments has become properly elucidated—in Tertullian's terms: when the truth of the tradition has been accepted—, that the new event of Christ's birth can be truly comprehended, that is, its salvific effect be passed on to the Christian community. In an exegetical excursion reminiscent of Irenaeus, he thus pairs Christ as the *nouissimus* Adam with the *primus* Adam in paradise, while the virgin Mary takes the place of the virgin earth of Eden, the *terra nondum generationi resignata.* In a different figurative reading, he depicts Mary's obedience to the angel Gabriel as the mirror image of Eve's obedience to the serpent. And in yet another example, Mary's delivery of Christ coun-

ters Eve's delivery of the devil (Cain) who murdered his brother.[27] Through their cumulative effect these different figurative readings help to strengthen Tertullian's claim that Christ has descended to earth to undo evil and give birth to salvation in a way that is both familiar (by being conceived in a human womb) and new (by receiving flesh from a virgin).

When we try to evaluate Tertullian's defense of the quality of Christ's flesh, it seems Christ's *nativitas* from a virgin points to a *novitas* which is neither specifically theological nor rhetorical, as this new sign proclaims a universal message. Revealing a unique comprehensiveness,[28] Christ's new birth forebodes the renewal of all of humanity. By physically taking flesh from a virgin, Christ, who himself was to remain a virgin in the flesh, inaugurates nothing less than the virginal regeneration of humanity in a spiritual sense. At the end of ch. 20 Tertullian describes the significance of Christ's birth as follows:

> What novelty there was in Christ, in his being born of a virgin, is plain: namely this and nothing else, that he was born of a virgin according to the rationale we have given, to the further intent that our regeneration should be virginal in a spiritual sense, sanctified from all defilements through Christ, who himself was a virgin even in the flesh, as he was born of the flesh of a virgin.[29]

Still, Tertullian stretches the newness of Christ's birth further than even a flexible approach to figurative exegesis appears to warrant. For instead of halting at the statement that Mary conceived as a virgin, he details how she gave birth as a wife, thereby issuing a claim which causes considerable theological embarrassment even today. Can his strategy perhaps be explained as an attempt to latch on to the mystery of Christ's birth of a virgin as yet another paradox, comparable to those he formulated in ch. 5? At first sight this would seem to be the case, as he speaks of Christ's birth in paradoxical terms as a *signum contradicibile*, a sign capable of being spoken against (cf. Luke 2:34).[30] Yet it is in trying to describe how Christ's human flesh impacts on Tertullian's mode of speech here in ch. 23, that Rogert Lambert's insight in the connection between flesh and speech proves most profitable. Rather than adding another paradox, it seems that Tertullian's insistence that Christ's birth is a *signum contradicibile* inverts the law of paradoxes as well as the practise of figurative exegesis by bringing the sign back to reality. For Tertullian, the old and the new do not merely foreshadow and complement each other so as to dovetail into the chain of salvation history, but in the *signum contradicibile* of Christ's birth of a virgin salvation history ultimately contracts to a point from which there is no escape: the concreteness of the human flesh.

In his desire to do justice to the concrete experience of the human flesh Tertullian comes to embrace the position that Mary sacrificed her virginity in childbirth. With the same steadfast belief with which he argued in ch. 1 that his defense of Christ's human flesh would lay down the law for humanity's bodily resurrection (. . . *dabit legem nostrae resurrectioni*), he doggedly clings here in ch. 23 to the law of the opened body (. . . *ipsa patefacti corporis lege*). In conformity with this law of the opened body, Tertullian is convinced that the process of giving birth cannot have failed to transform Mary from virgin into wife. To put it in his own words:

> With us, however, there is nothing doubtful, or that is twisted back into a plea that can recoil upon those who make it: light is light and darkness is darkness, and yea is yea and nay is nay, and what is more than this is on the side of evil. She bore which did bear: and if as a virgin she conceived, in her child-bearing she became a wife. For she became a wife by the very law of the opened body, in which it made no difference whether the force was that of a male let in or let out: the same sex performed that body's unsealing.[31]

While defending the quality of Christ's flesh Tertullian has concentrated on defending Christ's birth of a virgin as the most effective means to highlight the salvific novelty of his birth. Although Christ was conceived by a virgin, delivery transformed Mary from virgin into a wife. Only in this manner can the words of Is. 7:14 be devoid of contradictions: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive in the womb and shall bear a son." Dating back to an old prophecy, the new sign of Christ's birth portends how creation will be restored to its former glory through the virginal regeneration of humanity. Since Christ's birth is itself a *signum contradicibile*, a sign capable of being spoken against, Tertullian no longer needs the language of paradox to describe it. As the sign of Christ's birth is fraught with contradiction, it defies the paradoxes of human language, endowing it instead with a new persuasiveness.

Conclusion

For Tertullian, the meaning of the Incarnation is not that the divine Word comes to suspend the ordinary workings of the human body by being born in an extraordinary fashion. Rather, it seems the reverse is true. Since the divine Word by definition transcends human limitations, what better way to bring out the salvific intent of the Incarnation than to have the divine Word submit itself to the ordinary workings of the human

body? By joining the ranks of ordinary humans in experiencing a physical human birth, Christ the divine Word creates the possibility that humanity may join him in experiencing an extraordinary bodily resurrection. To vouchsafe the salvific novelty of this human birth of the divine Word, Tertullian describes its most striking feature as he explains how Mary became a wife *in partu*.

In the context of mounting allegations of logocentrism against the cultural and theological legacy of the West, Tertullian's *De carne Christi* is refreshing to read, as he makes the law of the opened body one wich even the divine Word chooses to heed. The effect of this "law of the opened body" on Tertullian's own mode of speech is that his former paradoxes come to an abrupt halt before the *signum contradicibile* of Christ's birth of a virgin who became a wife. As a consequence, Tertullian's human speech, recharged now that it is firmly anchored in Christ's human flesh, regains an adequacy previously unknown. It is the only fitting speech to proclaim not the paradox of the divine but, first and foremost, its constant reality. As Tertullian concludes in ch. 24:

> . . . that soul should be no other than the soul which is so-called, and flesh no other than the flesh which is visible, and God no other than he who is preached.[32]

NOTES

[1] Text and translation of *De carne Christi liber* (ca. 202/203) can be found in Ernest Evans (ed.), *Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation* (London: S.P.C.K., 1956) and Jean-Pierre Mahé (ed.), *Tertullien. La chair du Christ. Tome I/II* (SC 216/217; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1975). In what follows I shall quote the Latin text of Mahé's edition and, in slightly modified form, use Evans' English translation.

[2] See Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation*, x-xviii.

[3] See Robert D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 33, where Sider points to the crucial importance of ch. 17.1 for Tertullian's defense of Christ's humanity: . . . *ad unam lineam congressionem dirigamus: an carnem Christus ex virgine acceperit, ut hoc praecipue modo humanam eam constet, si ex humana matrice substantiam traxit*, ... See below n. 21.

[4] For the refutation of Sider, see J-P. Mahé, *Tertullien. La chair du Christ. Tome I*, SC 216: 181 n. 1.

[5] Cf. Tertullian in his *exordium* (I.1): *Igitur unde illi destruunt carnis uota, inde nobis erunt praestruenda.* This seems to imply that confirmation and refutation go indeed hand in hand.

[6] On pp. 181-196 Mahé structures his own rhetorical division around the subquestions Tertullian raised concerning Christ's flesh in ch. 1: *an est, unde est et cuiusmodi est.*

Mahé holds that Tertullian proves against Marcion that Christ's flesh is real (chs. 2-5: *an est*), against Apelles that Christ's body is not astral but earthly (chs. 6-9: *unde est*), and against the Valentinians that it is human (chs. 10-23: *cuiusmodi*). See further n. 11 below.

[7] The Valentinians apparently ridiculed Christians for standing by the contradictary claim that Mary was both virgin and non-virgin, i.e. mother of Christ (see below n. 27). According to Mahé, Tertullian devised his idiosyncratic solution by way of response to such attacks. Without further comment Mahé passes the following derogatory judgment on Tertullian's position in ch. 23: "Il faut croire que cette argumentation (scil. of the Valentinians) ne laissait pas de produire son effet, *puisqu'elle parvient à faire départir Tertullien de son habituel bon sens dans tout ce traité*: à lui faire nier la virginité de Marie *in partu*" (SC 216: 55-56). In his own comments on ch. 23, Evans called Tertullian's solution a sign of his "appalling bad taste" (cf. Evans, p. 180).

[8] Some of the challenges that postmodernism poses for patristic studies are addressed by Charles Kannengiesser in his "The Future of Patristics," *Theological Studies* 52 (1991) 128-139.

[9] For a critique of logocentrism as the ethnographic metaphysics of the West, see Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, transl. by G.C. Spivak (Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974) pp. 3-93 (Part I: Writing before the Letter), esp. pp. 3, 18, 43, 71, 74, 79. See also Mark C. Taylor, *Erring. A Postmodern A/theology* (Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1984) pp. 52-73.

[10] A recent study like Peter R.L. Brown, *Body and Society. Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) goes far to remedy this situation. Yet perhaps because of his focus on "body *and society*" Brown rarely engages in a more theological discussion of the body by addressing the problem of Incarnation. See further the study by C. Walker Bynum mentioned in n. 13 below.

[11] In this respect it is remarkable that even a staunch defender of western culture like Harold Bloom fails to include any Christian writing (apart from Augustine) prior to Dante in his *The Western Canon. The Books and School of the Ages* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1994).

[12] See John Updike, *Roger's Version* (New York: Fawcett Crest, 1986) pp. 160-189, esp. 160-163 (on the *De resurrectione carnis*) and 180-181 (on the *De carne Christi*).

[13] On Tertullian's views on bodily resurrection, see Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995) pp. 21-58, esp. pp. 34-43.

[14] See *De carne Christi* I.2: *Examinemus corporalem substantiam domini, de spiritali enim certum est. Caro quaeritur; ueritas et qualitas eius retractatur, an fuerit et unde et cuiusmodi fuerit. Renuntiatio eius dabit legem nostrae resurrectioni.* Against Mahé (see above n. 6), I hold that the *ueritas* and *qualitas* are the central problems surrounding Christ's flesh for Tertullian, which are further modified in the sub-clause: *an fuerit et unde et cuiusmodi fuerit.*

[15] See *De carne Christi* II.5: *Porro quod traditum erat, id erat uerum, ut ab eis traditum quorum fuit tradere. Ergo quod erat traditum rescindens, quod erat uerum rescidisti. Nullo iure fecisti.* This play with the term *ueritas* culminates in ch. 5, where different forms of the term occur a total of twelve times.

[16] See *De carne Christi* IV.3: *Amauit ergo cum homine etiam natiuitatem, etiam carnem eius. Nihil amari potest sine eo per quod est id quod est.* 4. *Aut aufer natiuitatem et exhibe hominem, adime carnem et praesta quem deus redemit.*

[17] See *De carne Christi* V.3: *Falso statuit inter nos scire Paulus tantum Iesum crucifixum* (cf. 1 Cor. 2:2), *falso sepultum ingessit* (cf. 1 Cor. 15:4), *falso resuscitatum inculcauit* (cf. 1 Cor. 15:17)?

[18] See *De carne Christi* V.4:

Crucifixus est dei filius; non pudet quia pudendum est.
Et mortuus est dei filius; credibile est quia ineptum est.
Et sepultus resurrexit; certum est quia impossibile.

An incorrect reading of the second paradox has yielded the famous paradox often attributed to Tertullian: *credo quia absurdum est.*

[19] See *De carne Christi* V.7: *Ita utriusque substantiae census hominem et deum exhibuit, hinc natum, inde non natum, hinc carneum, inde spiritalem, hinc infirmum, inde praefortem, hinc morientem, inde uiuentem. Quae proprietas condicionum, diuinae et humanae, aequa utique naturae cuiusque ueritate dispuncta est, eadem fide et spiritus et carnis: uirtutes spiritus dei deum, passiones carnem hominis probauerunt.*

[20] See *De carne Christi* V.8: *Quid dimidias mendacio Christum? Totus ueritas fuit.*

[21] Compare e.g. III.9, where Tertullian apodeictically states: *Non potest non fuisse quod scriptum est.*

[22] See *De carne Christi* V.9: *Maluit* (scil. Christus), *crede, nasci quam ex aliqua parte mentiri . . .*

[23] See *De carne Christi* V.10.

[24] See *De carne Christi* XVII.1 (cf. n. 3 above).

[25] See the continuation of *De carne Christi* XVII.1: (about the humanity of Christ's flesh) . . . *quamquam licuit iam et de nomine hominis et de statu qualitatis et de sensu tractationis et de exitu passionis humanam constitisse.*

[26] See *De carne Christi* XVII.2: *Ante omnia autem commendanda erit ratio quae praefuit ut dei filius de uirgine nasceretur. Noue nasci habebat nouae natiuitatis dedicator de qua signum daturus dominus ab Esaia praedicabatur. . . . . 3. Haec est natiuitas noua dum homo nascitur in deo ex quo in homine natus est deus carne antiqui seminis suscepta sine semine antiquo, ut illam nouo semine, id est spiritali, reformaret exclusis antiquitatis sordibus expiatam.*

[27] See *De carne Christi* XVII.3-6. For an interpretation of Tertullian's use of figurative speech, see E. Auerbach's article "Figura" in his *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature: Six Essays* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984) 11-76, esp. 28-34.

[28] In XXI.1 Tertullian speaks about the *tota nouitas* of Christ's birth, as through it flesh not born of seed (Christ) has proceeded from flesh born of seed (Mary).

[29] See *De carne Christi* XX.7: *Quid fuerit nouitatis in Christo ex uirgine nascendi, palam est: solum hoc scilicet quod ex uirgine secundum rationem quam edidimus, et uti uirgo esset regeneratio nostra spiritaliter, ab omnibus inquinamentis sanctificata per Christum, uirginem et ipsum etiam carnaliter, ut ex uirginis carne.*

[30] See *De carne Christi* XXIII.2: *Agnoscimus ergo signum contradicibile conceptum et partum uirginis Mariae de quo academici isti* (scil. the Valentinians): *"Peperit et non peperit virgo et non virgo," quasi non, et si ita esset dicendum, a nobis magis dici conueniret.*

[31] See *De carne Christi* XXIII.3: *Sed apud nos nihil dubium nec retortum in anticipitem defensionem: lux lux et tenebrae tenebrae et est est et non non, quod amplius, hoc a malo est. Peperit quae peperit, et si uirgo concepit in partu suo nupsit. 4. Nam nupsit ipsa patefacti corporis lege: in quo nihil interfuit de ui masculi admissi an emissi; idem illud sexus resignauit.*

[32] See *De carne Christi* XXIV.1: . . . *ut anima non alia sit quam quae uocatur et caro non alia quam quae uidetur et deus non alius quam qui praedicatur.* The literalness which underlies the

powerful efficacy of Tertullian's text here is similar to Calvin's literalness in his insistence on Christ's corporeal presence in heaven after his ascension, which caused him to reject the theory of transubstantiation. See John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* Bk IV, ch. 17.24, transl. by H. Beveridge (1989; repr. Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1995) p. 578: "He wills light to be light, darkness to be darkness, flesh to be flesh . . . Flesh must therefore be flesh, and spirit spirit; each under the law and condition on which God created them."

Dept. of Theology, Boston College,
140 Commonwealth Avenue,
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167-3806 U.S.A.

DIE *PARRHESIA* DES MENSCHEN VOR GOTT BEI JOHANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS

VON

G.J.M. BARTELINK

In den griechischen christlichen Schriften hat Parrhesia[1] sich zu einem wichtigen Terminus mit mehreren, nicht selten in einander überfliessenden Bedeutungen entwickelt (von "Freiheit, alles zu sagen," "Recht zu sprechen," "freimütiges Reden" zu "Freimut," "Zuversicht," "Vertraulichkeit," schliesslich etwa "Gunst," "Gnade," daneben auch in pejorativem Sinne—im Verhältnis von Menschen untereinander—"zu grosse Familiarität," "Unverschämtheit"). Das Wort hat seine Wurzeln in der profanen Welt. In der LXX, wo es zum ersten Mal in einem religiösen Kontext verwendet wurde, erhielt Parrhesia nur einen bescheidenen Platz. Für die spätere Verwendung durch christliche Autoren sind einige von den etwa 30 neutestamentlichen Stellen wesentlich gewesen.

Im profanen Bereich gehörte Parrhesia der politischen,[2] später auch der moralischen Sphäre an, wo das Wort namentlich das der Freundschaft eigene Recht bezeichnete, dem Freund seine Fehler zu zeigen. Für die Bedeutungsentwicklung bei den christlichen Schriftstellern hat sich als wichtig erwiesen, dass in der LXX zum ersten Male von der Parrhesia des Menschen gegenüber Gott die Rede ist (*Job* 22,26). Das ist etwas ganz Neues. Wir finden nachher diese Verwendung bei andern Vertretern der jüdisch-hellenistischen Welt (Philon und Flavius Josephus) wieder. Erwähnung verdient weiter, dass Philon der erste ist, der das reine Gewissen und die Verbundenheit mit Gott als Bedingungen für das Erwerben der Parrhesia gegenüber Gott nennt, wobei Abraham und Moses[3] als Beispiele erwähnt werden. Im Neuen Testament kommt ein derartiger Gedanke ebenfalls vor (1 *Joh.* 3,21: "Wenn unser Herz uns nicht verurteilt, besitzen wir Parrhesia gegenüber Gott"). Diese aus biblischen Wurzeln hervorgegangene Parrhesia des Menschen vor Gottes Angesicht wurde dominant von den christlichen Schriftstellern verwendet.

Wir möchten hier näher untersuchen, wie dieser wichtige Aspekt von

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 261-272

Johannes Chrysostomus beleuchtet wird, der sich nicht selten dieses Wortes bedient (öfters übrigens auch in der Bedeutung "Freimut" bei der Verkündigung des Evangeliums) und es selbst an einigen Stellen zentral stellt. Die zahlreichen Aussagen sind in einige Kategorien geordnet worden, wobei wir den wegen seiner rhetorischen Kraft berühmten Autor so viel wie möglich selbst zu Worte kommen lassen.

Die Parrhesia der grossen Gestalten des Alten Testaments, weiter der Apostel, Märtyrer und Mönche

Wie mehrere christliche Schriftsteller vor ihm betont Chrysostomus, dass die Parrhesia (die freimütige Zuversicht) gegenüber Gott ein Vorrecht der Christen ist, die durch die Taufe die Gunst bekommen haben, wie Söhne Gott ihren Vater nennen zu dürfen. Dadurch der göttlichen Natur teilhaftig, können sie mit Vertrauen "Abba, Vater" sagen (vgl. *Mt.* 20,1-16). Durch die Erlösung des Menschen hat sein Verhältnis zu Gott sich geändert, wie christliche Schriftsteller öfters unter Hinweis auf neutestamentliche Texte wie *Röm.* 8,15 darlegen.

Der Tradition folgend macht Chrysostomus eine Ausnahme für die grossen Gestalten des Alten Testaments. Vor seinem Sündenfall besass Adam die Parrhesia in reichem Masse: *In cap. 1 Gen. Hom.* 9 (PG 53,79). Gott selbst redete ja mit ihm im Paradies: *Hom. 3 dicta praesente imperatore* c. 1 (PG 63,473); vgl. *In quatriduanum Lazarum Hom.* (PG 59,780). Chrysostomus lässt Gott nach Adams Sünde zu ihm sagen: "Als ich dich verliess, warst du in Parrhesia und Herrlichkeit; jetzt aber finde ich dich in Schande und Schweigen" (*Ad populum Antiochenum Hom.* 7, PG 49,95).[4] Erst Christi Kreuzestod hat der Menschheit die Parrhesia Gott gegenüber wieder zurückgegeben: *In cap. 2 Gen. Hom.* 16 (PG 53,134). Zu bemerken ist hierbei, dass, während die Verbindung der Parrhesia mit dem paradiesischen Leben, dessen wir einst wieder teilhaft sein werden, zum Beispiel für den mystisch veranlagten Gregor von Nyssa wichtig war,[5] dies für Chrysostomus kaum der Fall ist. Wohl erwähnt er einen sich auf die paradiesische Vollkommenheit beziehenden Zug, nämlich Adams Herrschaft über die Tiere. Auch in Noachs Arche legten die gefährlichen Tiere ihre wilde Natur ab, und es war ein Zeichen der Parrhesia des Daniel, dass die Löwen ihn zahm wie Schafe umringten: *In cap. 7 Gen. Hom.* 25 (PG 53,225). Als nach dem Sündenfall der Freimut des Adam verschwunden war, fürchtete er die wilden Tiere: *In cap. 1 Gen. Hom.* 9 (PG 53,79).

Wie Adam sprach auch Abraham zuversichtlich mit Gott: *De incompre-*

hensibili Dei natura 2 (PG 48,712). Abraham war ein Vorbild, indem er zeigte, dass selbst zu einer grossen Parrhesia sich die Demut gesellen muss: *De prophetarum obscuritate* 2,6 (PG 56,184).[6] Die drei Erzväter waren nach Chrysostomus dermassen von Parrhesia erfüllt, dass Gott sich nicht zu schämen brauchte, von ihnen angerufen zu werden, und selbst sagte: "Ich bin der Gott von Abraham, Isaak und Jakob" (*In Ep. ad Hebr. 11 Hom.* 24,3, PG 63,170).

Auch Joseph in Ägypten erfreute sich der Parrhesia. Merkwürdig ist, dass Chrysostomus der heidnischen Frau Potiphars dieses Wort in seiner jüdisch-christlichen Bedeutung in den Mund legt:[7] *In Ep. 1 ad Cor. Hom.* 32,7 (PG 61,273). Insbesondere Moses, der *Exod.* 33,11 Gottes Freund genannt wird, besass grosse Parrhesia bei Gott: *Ep. 2,7 ad Olympiadem* (PG 52,563); *In illud, Vidi Dominum Hom.* 1,4 (PG 56,104): *Ecloga de ieiunio et temperantia Hom.* 4 (PG 63,600). Unter den Propheten ragt nach Chrysostomus Elia als Besitzer des Freimuts empor, ist er auch weiter besitzlos. Daher vermag er trotz seiner menschlichen Beschränkung grosse Wunder zu wirken:[8] *In Heliam et viduam Hom.* c. 7 (PG 51,343); *In illud Isaiae, Ego Dominus* (PG 56,149).[9] Und die drei Jünglinge im babylonischen Feuerofen besassen eben inmitten der Flammen in hohem Masse Gottes Gunst, wodurch sie auch für andere beten konnten: *In Ep. ad Rom. Hom.* 14,8 (PG 60,535); vgl. *Quod nemo laeditur nisi a semetipso* 16 (PG 52,477: Prüfungen vermehren die Parrhesia).

Die Apostel sind als direkte Jünger Christi reichlich der Parrhesia teilhaftig, unter ihnen an erster Stelle Petrus und Johannes:[10] *In Matth. Hom.* 75,1 (PG 58,687). Petrus, der von Christus "die Schlüssel des Himmelreichs" empfangen hat, überragt die anderen auch im Besitz der Parrhesia: *In Matth. Hom.* 58,2 (PG 58,568). Diese zeigt sich offen in seiner freimütigen Verkündigung des Glaubens nach der Himmelfahrt Christi: *In cap. 9 Gen. Hom.* 28 (PG 53,259). Die Parrhesia der Apostel Christus gegenüber ist wie der Freimut unter Freunden; daher kann auch der Herr auf Grund davon ihnen, wo nötig, Vorwürfe machen: *In Matth. Hom.* 53,3 (PG 58,529).[11] Die überschwengliche Parrhesia des Apostels Paulus bei Gott ist, wie Chrysostomus bemerkt, mit Demut verbunden; er bezeichnet sich ja als den geringsten der Apostel: *In cap. 11 et 12 Gen. Hom.* 31 (PG 53,285). Eben diese Demut ermöglicht es ihm, freimütig das Evangelium zu verkünden: *In Ep. 1 ad Cor. Hom.* 39,1 (PG 61,333).[12]

Die Märtyrer, die durch ihren Opfertod viel bei Gott vermögen, und die zur Zeit des Chrysostomus grosse Verehrung genossen, sind für ihn eine spezielle Kategorie. Der Märtyrertod gewährt ohne weiteres die Parrhesia.

So erlangte der Protomartyr Stephanus in einer Vision die Gewissheit der himmlichen Parrhesia: *In Act. Ap.* 15,4 und 17,2 (PG 60,124 und 137). In seiner Polemik mit den Juden mahnt Chrysostomus die Christen, ihre eigenen Heroen zu verehren. Sie sollten nicht die jüdischen Feste mitfeiern; es gebe ja die eigenen christlichen Feste der Märtyrer, die sich als spezielle Freunde Gottes in reichem Masse der Parrhesia erfreuten: *Adv. Judaeos Hom.* 8,7 (PG 48,937). Die Mönche, deren Leben wie ein tägliches Martyrium ist, galten für die Christen als die Nachfolger der Märtyrer, als die neuen Heroen. Viele unter ihnen besassen die Parrhesia in hohem Masse.[13]

Alle christlichen Heiligen sind der Freundschaft Gottes teilhaftig und haben durch ihr vollkommenes Leben ein für allemal Parrhesia erworben: *Expos. in ps.* 41,3 (PG 55,160). Öfters betont Chrysostomus, dass die Heiligen unsere Vorbilder sind. Geben wir darum unseren Kindern nicht willkürliche Namen, nennen wir sie nicht nach unseren Vorfahren, sondern nach den Heiligen, die durch ihren heroischen Lebenswandel unsere Fürsprecher bei Gott sind: *In cap. 5 et 6 Gen. Hom.* 2,1 (PG 53,179). Der Besitz der Parrhesia bei Gott verleiht dem Menschen Mut und innerliche Kraft, welche zu seinen Beschränkungen und seiner körperlichen Schwäche in scharfem Kontrast stehen: *De incomprehensibili Dei natura* 3 (PG 48,722). Wer sie besitzt, so Chrysostomus, ist stark trotz seinem sterblichen Körper: *De diabolo tentatore Hom.* 2,4 (PG 49,262). Dieser Besitz kann sich im freimütigen Bekennen des Glaubens oder im Eintreten für eine gerechte Sache manifestieren, bisweilen auch in thaumaturgischer Kraft. Sie ist oft für die Umgebung wahrnehmbar, zum Beispiel am strahlenden Antlitz (vgl. *In principium Actuum Hom.* 4,8, PG 51,109: die Apostel nach der Auferstehung Christi). Sie ist etwas Dynamisches und will immer vermehrt werden. Besitzt man selbst den Glauben im Besitz der Parrhesia, so kommt das Verlangen auf, ihn auch anderen zu verkünden: *De verbis apostoli, Habentes eundem spiritum Hom.* 3,4 (PG 51,293). Gegen denjenigen, der sich Gottes Gunst erfreut, vermag der Teufel nur wenig: *De diabolo tentatore Hom.* 2,4 (PG 49,262).

Parrhesia und Gebet

Das Gebet, wodurch der Mensch unmittelbaren Kontakt mit Gott zu erlangen sucht, setzt die Parrhesia beim Beter voraus. Man soll Gott, so Chrysostomus, nur auf Grund einer richtigen Gesinnung, einer gerechten Lebensführung und der dazu passenden Parrhesia anrufen: *In Acta apost.*

Hom. 5,2 (PG 60,52). Je grösser die Parrhesia bei Gott, desto wertvoller und wirkungsvoller wird das Gebet sein: *Ep.* 92 (PG 52,656). Das Gebet selbst vermehrt auch unser Recht auf Freimut. Um erhört zu werden, soll das Gebet uneigennützig sein. Freimütiges Gebet ist nur möglich, wenn man etwas fragt, das mit Gottes Absichten in Übereinstimmung ist: *Expos. in ps.* 5,2 (PG 55,64).[14] Denn nicht jedes Gebet kann man mit Parrhesia aussprechen. Betet man gegen die Feinde, dann verliert man sofort die mit dem richtigen Gebet verbundene Parrhesia: *In Ep. 2 ad Cor. Hom.* 5,4 (PG 61,433). "Denn wenn du sagst, 'Schlage den Feind'..., hat deine Zunge die Parrhesia verloren... Man soll im Gegenteil für sie beten, dann wird man auch mit Parrhesia beten können:" *Ecloga de oratione Hom.* 2 (PG 63,589). Das Gebet eines einzelnen für viele ist verwegen, dazu braucht man viel Parrhesia: *Ecloga de oratione Hom.* 2 (PG 63,586). Chrysostomus betont, dass die Parrhesia (Recht auf Freimut), welche auf einem gemeinschaftlichen Gebet beruht, viel grösser ist als jene, welche aus einem individuellen Gebet erwächst: *De incomprehensibili Dei natura* 3,6 (PG 48,726). Bei Krankheit darf man nicht sowohl bei den Dämonen (mittels Amuletten und Zaubersprüchen) als bei Gott Hilfe suchen: "Wie kannst du dann wieder zu Gott beten? Dann wird auch kein anderer, selbst wenn er die Parrhesia des Moses besitzen würde, für dich beten können."[15] Dass er sich mit Zuversicht an Gott wenden kann, verdankt der Mensch der durch die Taufe erworbenen Kindschaft Gottes. Gott ist für uns ein Vater. Die Katechumenen, welche diese Kindschaft nicht besitzen und das Vaterunser nicht beten dürfen, verfügen noch nicht über die zum Gebet erforderliche Parrhesia und sind dadurch vom Gebet anderer Christen abhängig: *In Ep. 2 ad Cor. Hom.* 2,5 (PG 61,399). Je grösser die Parrhesia, desto grösser die Möglichkeit erhört zu werden. Diejenigen, sagt Chrysostomus, welche am meisten Gottes Gunst besitzen, können am besten beten, dass das Elend in dieser Welt ein Ende nehme: *Ep.* 221 (PG 52,733). Ein mit Parrhesia ausgesprochenes Gebet kann selbst in grosser Entfernung eine helfende Wirkung haben: *Ep.* 70 (PG 52,647). Wenn einer, der Unrecht erlitten hat, für denjenigen betet, der ihm das Unrecht angetan hat, besitzt er dadurch grosse Parrhesia: *In Ep. ad Eph. c. 4 Hom.* 11,6 (PG 62,88). Das Vaterunser lehrt uns, unseren Schuldigern zu vergeben, um voller Zuversicht zu Gott beten zu können: *In Ep. ad Philem. Hom.* 1,3 (PG 62,707); vgl. *In Ep. ad Hebr. c. 10 Hom.* 19,1 (PG 63,139).

Parrhesia und die eigene Leistung

Auf Grund der Taufe und der dadurch erlangten Kindschaft Gottes hat der Christ Zugang zur Parrhesia, die mit der wachsenden Vollkommenheit zunimmt. Es gibt mehrere Stufen in der Gunst Gottes. Schon der einfache Christ, der sich um die Tugend bemüht, ist daran beteiligt, es ist jedoch erst das Erreichen eines hohen Grades der Vollkommenheit, wodurch man sie reichlich erwirbt. Viel mehr als die meisten anderen christlichen Schriftsteller betont Chrysostomus, dass der Glaube allein nicht genügt und dass die eigenen Leistungen unentbehrlich sind um in den Besitz der Parrhesia zu gelangen.[16] Durch unsere Anstrengungen auf Erden, sollten wir uns viel Parrhesia für das künftige Leben aufspeichern, so lautet mehrmals seine Ermahnung am Ende einer Homilie: z.B. *In cap. 1 Gen. Hom.* 2 (PG 53,32). Die Fastenzeit bietet mehr als sonst die Gelegenheit, sich geistliche Zuversicht zu erwerben: *Ad populum Antiochenum Hom.* 20 (PG 49,197). Es ist jedoch verfehlt, sich der durch die eigenen Werke erworbenen Parrhesia zu rühmen: *In cap. 5 et 6 Gen. Hom.* 21 (PG 53,179).

Es gibt viele Möglichkeiten, die Türen der Parrhesia zu Gott (des Gottvertrauens) zu öffnen, wie das Zuhören bei der Verkündung von Gottes Wort, Versöhnung mit dem Feind und das Geben von Almosen: *In cap. 1 Gen. Hom.* 10 (PG 53,83). Jedenfalls müssen wir uns selbst anstrengen, sei es, dass bisweilen schon eine geringe Anstrengung genügt: vgl. *In illud, Vidi Dominum Hom.* 6,3 (PG 56,139). Gott wartet damit, uns die Parrhesia zu schenken, bis wir wenigstens die richtige Gesinnung haben[17] und unseren guten Willen zeigen.[18] Im Gegensatz zu äusserlichen Sachen wie Reichtum und Besitz, so Chrysostomus, wobei er sich den stoischen Gegensatz *sua/aliena* zu eigen macht (*In Kalendas* 3, PG 48,958), gehört die Parrhesia zur Kategorie der Dinge, die man wirklich zu seinem eigenen Besitz machen kann.[19]

Unter den guten Werken, die der Mensch tun soll, nimmt für Chrysostomus das Geben von Almosen eine wichtige Stelle ein. Er formuliert es gerne so, dass man sozusagen das Almosen für künftige Parrhesia (Gottvertrauen) eintauscht. Was man hier schenkt, bekommt man später selbst wieder zurück. Chrysostomus verwendet gerne das Thema, die Parrhesia sei eine Gegenleistung der Armen. Seine Formulierungen erinnern an das römische *do ut des*-Prinzip: "Du siehst, dass die Sache ein Geschäft ist. Es ist ja auch ein gemeinsames Abkommen. Du bringst das Geld ein. Die Armen verleihen dir ihrerseits das Gottvertrauen:" *In Ep. ad Rom. Hom.* 21,3 (PG 60,606); vgl. *In dictum Pauli, oportet haereses esse Hom.* c. 5 (PG 51,260); *De verbis apo-*

stoli, Habentes eundem spiritum Hom. 2,9 (PG 51,280) und *Hom.* 3,7 (PG 51,287). Durch das Geben von Almosen bekommen die Reichen etwas von der ihnen fehlenden Parrhesia, welche die Armen eben im Überfluss besitzen: *In Ep. 2 ad Cor. Hom.* 17,2 (PG 61,519; anlässlich 2 *Cor.* 9,15).[20] Die ausgestreckten Hände der Armen bieten uns das Himmelreich und verleihen uns Gottes Gunst: *Ecloga de eleemosyna et hospitalitate Hom.* 23 (PG 63,720); vgl. *In Ep. ad Hebr. c. 12 Hom.* 32,3 (PG 63,233). Wer zeitlebens die Armut bekämpft, vermehrt die Parrhesia: *Ecl. de eleem. et hosp. Hom.* 23 (PG 63,730).[21] Das Almosen hilft beiden Parteien: *In Joh. Hom.* 85,6 (PG 59,468). Bedingung für den Geber ist, dass sein Almosen rein ist, dass es nicht aus unrechtmässig erworbenem Besitz herrührt: In *Ep. ad Hebr. c. 12 Hom.* 32,3 (PG 63,223).

Zu den guten Werken, wodurch man sich Gottvertrauen erwirbt, gehört auch das standhaft Ertragen von Trübsal und Leid. Der Apostel Paulus ist ein Vorbild, der sich einen Schatz von Parrhesia erworben hat, indem er seine Krankheit mutig ertrug: *Ep. 4,3 ad Olympiadem* (PG 52,594; anlässlich 1 *Tim.* 5,23). So vermehrten auch eben die Trübsale, welche Joseph in Ägypten erlitt, seine Parrhesia: *Expos. in ps.* 139,1 (PG 55,420). Im allgemeinen nimmt, wenn man das Unglück mutig erträgt, die Parrhesia zu: *Ep. 4,3 ad Olympiadem* (PG 52,593). Eben diejenigen, welche Unrecht standhaft ertragen, haben mehr Möglichkeiten, Gottes Gunst zu erlangen: *Expos. in ps.* 108,4 (PG 55,263). Wenn man mütig das Unrecht erträgt, besitzt man grössere Parrhesia: *In Matth. Hom.* 40,4 (PG 57,444).[22]

Doch schränkt Chrysostomus die Bedeutung der guten Werke anderswo wieder ein. Schliesslich ist es, so betont er, nicht das menschliche Bemühen, sondern Gottes Liebe zu den Menschen, welche das Heil bewirkt: *Expos. in ps.* 116,1 (PG 55,327). Parrhesia ist ein Geschenk Gottes, aber dieser trägt unseren Taten Rechnung: *In Ep. ad Philem. Hom.* 2,1 (PG 62,709). Man soll sich nicht der Parrhesia, die man sich durch seinen Lebenswandel erworben hat, rühmen, sondern seine Zuflucht bei Gott suchen: *Expos. in ps.* 142,6 (PG 55,456). Dieser geht in seiner Liebe zu den Menschen so weit, dass er nicht nur Mitleid mit den Sündern hat, sondern auch selbst Reue und Eifer für die Tugend bei ihnen bewirkt, so dass sie durch ihre Werke Parrhesia erwerben können: *Expos. in ps.* 144,3 (PG 55,468). Die Liebe Gottes zu den Menschen gibt dem Sünder Vergebung und dem, der sich sehr angestrengt hat, Vermehrung der Parrhesia: *In Matth. Hom.* 61,5 (PG 58,595).[23] So hat Gott auch mit Absicht seine Gaben für Daniel auf später verschoben, damit dieser sich desto grösserer Parrhesia erfreute: *In Danielem* 1 (PG 56,196).

Die eschatologische Perspektive

Mit der Mahnung, man soll sich im entscheidenden Augenblick des Urteils der Parrhesia versichern,[24] enden mehrere Homilien des Chrysostomus, wobei die stereotype Formulierung auffällt: z.B. *In illud, Si esurierit inimicus Hom.* c. 1 (PG 51,173); *Ad illuminandos catechumenos* 1,5 (PG 49,232).[25] Wenn selbst der Gerechte mit Zittern und Zagen dem Urteil entgegensieht, "woher werden wir an jenem Tage Parrhesia haben?:" *Ecloga de virtute et vitio Hom.* 2 (PG 63,741). Nur rechtzeitige Busse, Abschwören der Sünde und Besserung des Lebenswandels ermöglichen es, einst mit Parrhesia vor dem Richterstuhl Christi zu stehen: *Expos. in ps.* 6,4 (PG 55,76); *In Ep. 2 ad Cor. Hom.* 4,6 (PG 61,428); *In Ep. 2 ad Cor. Hom.* 9,4 (PG 61,466); *De Lazaro* 4,7 (PG 48,1016). Chrysostomus nennt die tägliche Gewissenserforschung ein wichtiges Instrument dazu: *In Matth. Hom.* 42,4 (PG 57,455). Die Parrhesia kann man sich durch einen guten Lebenswandel bereits in dieser Welt aufspeichern: *In Acta apost. Hom.* 1,8 (PG 60,26). Man soll immer das Jüngste Gericht vor Augen haben und bei allem, was man tut, abwägen, was unser Gottvertrauen vermehrt und was nicht: *In cap. 1 Gen. Hom.* 5 (PG 53,47). Wenn du behauptest, so Chrysostomus, es gebe kein Urteil nach dem Tode, "dann sagst du das wegen deiner vielen Sünden; es fehlt dir die Parrhesia:" *In Ep. ad Col. 1 Hom.* 2,5 (PG 62,316). Die künftige Parrhesia kompensiert die Schwierigkeiten auf Erden, wie die Händler des Gewinnes wegen dem Meere trotzen: *In Joh. Hom.* 77,4 (PG 59,418). Der Priester, der die wichtige Aufgabe hat, seine Herde kräftig vor Vergehen zu warnen, kann sich viel Parrhesia sammeln, wenn er viele Menschen aus den Stricken des Teufels gerettet hat: *Adv. Judaeos* 7,6 (PG 48,926). Eine gute Amtsausübung wird ihm die künftige Parrhesia gewährleisten, so dass Christus ihn in sein ewiges Wohnzelt aufnehmen wird: *De sacerdotio* 6,13 (PG 48,692). In einer Antithese betont Chrysostomus, dass der Beifall der Zuhörer dem Prediger zwar irdischen Ruhm verleiht, aber dass es die sich in Gottesfurcht zeigende Auswirkung der Predigt ist, welche ihm viel Zuversicht vor dem Richterstuhl Christi schenkt: *In illud, Si esurierit inimicus* c. 1 (PG 51,173). Vernachlässigung der Seele verringert sie: *Adv. Judaeos* 4,7 (PG 48,881).

Die Sünden vertreiben die Parrhesia, reumütige Gesinnung gibt sie wieder

Wenn Chrysostomus in seinen Homilien betont, dass der Sünder die Parrhesia gegenüber Gott entbehrt, wird uns bewusst, dass er aus der täglichen Praxis heraus spricht und dass wir hier weit von der hohen Stelle

entfernt sind, welche die Parrhesia im Vollkommenheitsstreben der Mönche einnimmt. Der Prediger ermutigt den Sünder und zeigt ihm, wie die Reue die Scham vertreibt und wieder zu Zuversicht verhilft: *De paenitentia* 8,2 (PG 49,338).[26] Wenn dieser seine Ungerechtigkeit bereut, kann er wieder mit Freimut zum Hause Gottes hinaufgehen: *Expos. in ps.* 6,4 (PG 55,77).[27] Der reuevolle Zöllner im Tempel soll ihm zeigen, wie demütige Reue die verlorene Parrhesia zurückgibt: *Non esse desperandum* 1 (PG 51,365). In derselben Homilie arbeitet Chrysostomus das Motiv weiter aus: *ibid.* 8 (PG 51,370): "Das habe ich erwähnt, damit du nicht sagst: 'Ich bin ohne Parrhesia, ich vermag nicht zu beten.' Wer meint, die Parrhesia nicht zu besitzen, ist eben im Besitz der Parrhesia. Wer meint, die Parrhesia zu besitzen, hat sie verloren wie der Pharisäer. Derjenige jedoch, der sich selbst als verworfen und ohne Parrhesia betrachtet, wird am meisten erhört werden wie der Zöllner." Diese Stelle, an der Chrysostomus einen Sünder sagen lässt, er sei ohne Parrhesia, zeigt, wie allgemein bekannt dieser Wortgebrauch war. Reumütige Gesinnung genügt schon, um die Parrhesia wieder zu erlangen: "Der Teufel flösst dir den Gedanken ein, zu sagen: 'Ich besitze keine Parrhesia.' Man soll sich eben im Gebet an Gott richten, um dadurch viel Parrhesia zu bekommen. Gott selbst will dich von deinen Fehlern befreien. Besitzt du keine Parrhesia? Durch deine Gesinnung kannst du dir Parrhesia erwerben. Dass du meinst keine Parrhesia zu besitzen, bedeutet eben eine sehr grosse Parrhesia für dich:" *De decem milium talentorum debitore Hom.* c. 6 (PG 51,26). Der Redner versteht es, seine Paränese in eine effektvolle Antithese einzukleiden. Anderswo zieht er biblische Vorbilder heran, um den Sünder zu ermutigen. David bereute seine Sünde und rief aus: "Ich suche meine Schönheit, ich suche meine Parrhesia. Wasche mich noch mehr rein von meiner Ungerechtigkeit" (*Ps.* 50,4; *Ecloga de peccato et confessione Hom.* 24, PG 63,741). Christus selbst war mild für die Sünder. Er ging in ihre Häuser hinein, um mit ihnen zu essen und schenkte dem guten Schächer am Kreuze Vergebung: *In Isaiam* 7 (PG 56,85); *De cruce et latrone Hom.* 1,3 (PG 49,402); *ibid. Hom.* 2,4 (PG 49,413); *In cap. 1 Gen. Hom.* 5 (PG 53,49).

Aus den zahlreichen Parrhesia-Stellen bei Johannes Chrysostomus geht namentlich hervor, wieviel Wert er auf die Übung der Tugend und der guten Werke für das Erhalten dieser göttlichen Gabe legt, deren Besitz unentbehrlich ist, wenn man vor Gottes Richterstuhl erscheint. Er legt dar, wie das Geben von Almosen im irdischen Leben sozusagen fast automatisch von seiten der Armen mit der Gabe der Parrhesia ausgeglichen wird. Wiederholt mahnt er seine Zuhörer, man solle sich Parrhesia für später

aufspeichern. Diese eschatologische Perspektive war für Chrysostomus besonders wichtig.

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] Meistens haben wir in der Übersetzung oder Paraphrase das Wort Parrhesia beibehalten. Die Bedeutungsschattierungen, die sich zwischen den beiden Polen "Freimut" ("freimütiges Reden") und "Zuversicht" bewegen, ergeben sich leicht aus dem Kontext. Die Literatur bis 1970 findet man im Artikel *Fiducia* von L.J. Engels (RAC 7,876-877) und in meinem Artikel *Parrhesia* in *Graecitas et Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, Supplementa* III,1 (Nijmegen 1970) 7-9. Neuere Studien gibt es nur wenige. Die Studie von W.C. van Unnik im Sammelband *Sparsa Collecta. Collected Essays. III Patristica-Gnostica-Liturgica* (Nov. Test., Supplements 31 (Leiden 1983) 134-143) datiert schon von 1963. Einige Aspekte der Verwendung von Parrhesia bei Johannes Chrysostomus (die attributiven Bestimmungen, das Spiel mit der Vieldeutigkeit, rhetorische Effekte, Vergleichung mit der Verwendung bei Gregorius von Nyssa) werden kurz im meinem Artikel *Parrhesia dans les œuvres de Jean Chrysostome* besprochen (in: *Studia Patristica* 16, Edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone, Berlin 1985, 441-448; hier finden sich auch einige Nachträge zur Bibliographie: 441, Anm. 1).

[2] Chrysostomus bedient sich bisweilen einer Anspielung auf diese ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Wortes (die Redefreiheit des freien Bürgers in einer demokratischen griechischen Stadt), indem er eine Verbindung mit der christlichen Bürgerschaft im Himmel herstellt. Sind wir auf Erden nur Fremdlinge, dort sind wir Bürger und empfangen wir als solche auch die Parrhesia. Im Gegensatz zur politischen Parrhesia erfreuen sich in der Kirche alle der Parrhesia im gleichen Masse, auch Frauen und Sklaven: *De studio praesentium* 2 *Hom.* 5 (PG 63,487).

[3] *Quis rerum divin. heres* 5-29; vgl. W. Völker, Das Abraham-Bild bei Philo, Origenes und Ambrosius, *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* 103 (1931) 199-207.

[4] Vgl. *In cap. 2 Gen. Hom.* 16 (PG 53,131).

[5] Vgl. R. Joly, Sur deux thèmes mystiques de Grégoire de Nysse, *Byzantion* 36 (1966; Mélanges H. Grégoire III) 127-137; siehe auch *In Gen. Hom.* 3 (PG 54,592).

[6] Vgl. auch *In cap. 20 Gen. Hom.* 45 (PG 54,420); *Ad populum Antiochenum Hom.* 19,1 (PG 49,189).

[7] Derartige sprachliche Versehen oder forcierte Anpassungen an den christlichen Sprachgebrauch finden sich bisweilen auch anderswo in der frühchristlichen Literatur. Einige Beispiele bei G.J.M. Bartelink, Le vocabulaire paléo-chrétien dans les écrits des auteurs profanes, *Sacris Erudiri* 23 (1978-79) 15, Anm. 29.

[8] Grosse Parrhesia kann mit thaumaturgischer Kraft verbunden sein. Ein hoher Grad von Vollkommenheit ermöglicht das Erwerben von Charismata. Vgl. B. Flusin, *Miracle et histoire dans l'œuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis* (Etudes Augustiniennes) (Paris 1983) 163.

[9] Weiter z.B. *De incomprehensibili Dei natura* 3 (PG 48,722): Daniel; *De virginitate* 84 (PG 48,598): Noach, Job, Daniel; *In cap. 19 Gen. Hom.* 43 (PG 54,397): dieselben drei als Vorbilder Gerechter mit grosser Parrhesia.

[10] Vgl. *In illud, Saulus adhuc spirans, De mutatione nominum Hom.* 1,4 (PG 51,119): Johannes, der geliebte Jünger Christi; *In illud, In faciem ei restiti Hom.* 6 (PG 51,377, anlässlich *Mt.* 26,21):

Petrus brauchte, um sich an Christus zu wenden, die grosse Parrhesia des Johannes.

[11] Vgl. *In Matth. Hom.* 52,2-3 (PG 58,520-521, anlässlich *Mt.* 15,21 f.): Die Parrhesia der Apostel wird mit dem Durchhaltevermögen der kanaanitischen Frau verglichen. Die 72 Jünger (*Luc.* 10,1) nahmen nach den Aposteln den zweiten Platz ein und ihre Parrhesia war geringer: *De proditione Judae Hom.* 1 (PG 49,375); *Hom.* 2 (PG 49,395).

[12] Als Lehrer der ganzen damaligen Welt darf Paulus mit Parrhesia reden: *In cap. 30 Gen. Hom.* 57 (PG 54,504).

[13] Die Mönche in Antiochien zeigen apostolische Parrhesia: *Ad populum Antioch. Hom.* 17,2 (PG 49,175).

[14] Vgl. Theodoretus van Cyrus, *Hist. Philothea* 1,3 (der Asket Jakobus): "Weil seine Parrhesia Tag für Tag zunahm und weil er Gott fragte, was man fragen sollte, bekam er es unverzüglich."

[15] *Ecloga de adversa valetudine et medicis Hom.* 13 (PG 63,654); ähnlich *De sacerdotio* 6,4 (PG 48,681).

[16] Vgl. *In Ep. 2 ad Cor. Hom.* 2,6 (PG 61,401); *Expos. in ps.* 43,1 (PG 55,168). Die Verdienste unserer guten Werke auf Erden werden aufgespeichert, sie gehen uns voraus und öffnen uns die Türen der Parrhesia bei dem Herrn: *In cap. 1 Gen. Hom.* 5 (PG 53,49); vgl. *In cap. 21 Gen. Hom.* 46 (PG 54,428); *In cap. 9 Gen. Hom.* 27 (PG 53,247); *In Matth. Hom.* 66,1 (PG 58,625); *In dimissionem Chananaeae Hom.* 4 (PG 52,452); *In cap. 5 et 6 Gen. Hom.* 21,3 (PG 53,179); *Expos. in ps.* 146,2 (PG 55,478); *Adv. oppugnatores vitae monasticae* 3,20 (PG 47,384); *De compunctione ad Stelechium* 2,7 (PG 47,422); *Expos. in ps.* 43,1 (PG 55,168).

[17] Chrysostomus warnt gegen die Parrhesia, die nur äusserliche Haltung ist und nicht von Gott kommt. Es gibt Menschen, die tagsüber viele Sünden begehen und doch abends zur Kirche gehen und sich die Hände waschen, um sie dann mit vieler Parrhesia zu Gott emporzuheben: *In Ep. 2 ad Timoth. 3 Hom.* 7 (PG 62,635).

[18] Ein gerechtes Leben verstärkt die Parrhesia, wie Chrysostomus z.B. bei der Erklärung von *Ps.* 4,1 darlegt: Mit der Gerechtigkeit meine der Psalmist die Parrhesia bei Gott: *Expos. in ps.* 4,1 (PG 55,40). Bei den zwei Blinden in der Nähe von Jericho ersetzte ihr Enthusiasmus die auf Grund ihres Lebens fehlende Parrhesia: *In Matth. Hom.* 66 (PG 58,625); anlässlich *Mt.* 20,29 ff.). Wenn wir in der Fastenzeit nicht nur auf Speisen, sondern auch auf die Sünde verzichten, werden wir uns hier auf Erden und im künftigen Leben vieler Parrhesia erfreuen: *In cap. 1 Gen. Hom.* 9 (PG 53,81).

[19] Vgl. *In cap. 48 Gen. Hom.* 46 (PG 54,570): Nicht hohe Würde oder Ansehen, sondern eigene Leistung öffnet die Türen zur Parrhesia. Weiter *In cap. 47 Gen. Hom.* 65 (PG 54,564).

[20] Wer mildtätig ist, ist Wohltäter für sich selbst. Missgönnt man jedoch den Armen die Gaben, so beraubt man sich selbst der Parrhesia: *In Joh. Hom.* 77,5 (PG 59,420).

[21] Vgl. auch *In cap. 11 Gen. Hom.* 30 (PG 53,276); *In cap. 14 Gen. Hom.* 35 (PG 53,332); *In illud, vidua eligatur* (PG 51,334; anlässlich *Mt.* 10,13-15); *In Heliam et viduam Hom.* c. 1 (PG 51,337).

[22] Vgl. auch *De resurrectione mortuorum* (PG 50,422).

[23] Vgl. auch *In Ep. ad Rom. Hom.* 16,9 (PG 60,561; anlässlich *Rom.* 9,23): das meiste kommt von Gott, doch müssen wir auch Einiges einbringen.

[24] Der Gedanke geht auf 1 *Joh.* 4,17 zurück: "damit wir am Tage des Gerichtes Parrhesia besitzen."

[25] Vgl. auch *In cap. 17 Gen. Hom.* 40 (PG 53,374).
[26] Der Sünder, der seine Sünden aufrichtig bereut, soll sich nicht als verurteilt und der Parrhesia verlustig gegangen betrachten: *In Ep. ad Hebr. 12 Hom.* 31,3 (PG 63,216).
[27] Indem er der Sünde Parrhesia und der Reue Scham verliehen hat, hat der Teufel die richtige Ordnung zerstört: *De paenitentia* 8,2 (PG 49,339).

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152

FEUILLETS COPTES NON IDENTIFIÉS DU PRÉTENDU *ÉVANGILE DE BARTHÉLEMY*

PAR

ENZO LUCCHESI

En identifiant, non sans quelque mérite, le N° 99 du catalogue, dû à Bentley Layton, des manuscrits coptes entrés à la British Library depuis 1906,[1] comme deux fragments du prétendu *Évangile de Barthélemy*, en guise de complément au dernier dossier en date,[2] M^me^ Gonnie van den Berg-Onstwedder[3] termine par ces mots: "In conclusion a survey of the fragments of the Bibliothèque National (*sic*) and some of the fragments from the Louvre did not bring to light any fitting fragments"; et en note: "Seeing the thoroughness of Lacau's work I think that these fragments will certainly not be in the Bibliothèque National (*sic*)."[4]

Indépendamment du fait que les fragments de la British Library sont à rattacher au codex A, et non pas au codex B, de Lacau,[5] comme le veut M^me^ van den Berg-Onstwedder se perdant un peu dans sa description,[6] qui peut aujourd'hui affirmer en connaissance de cause qu'il n'existe pas dans l'immense (et en grande partie inexploré) fonds copte de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris un seul fragment relatif à ce texte bartholomien, avec tout le respect pour la "thoroughness" du travail de Lacau? Or il se trouve bel et bien, à Paris et ailleurs, non moins de quatre nouveaux folios se rapportant à ce soi-disant apocryphe de Barthélemy et qui viennent opportunément s'ajouter aux maigres restes des deux codices fragmentaires A et B, originaires du Monastère Blanc, outre bien entendu les "deux feuillets inédits du codex A, conservés à Vienne (Nationalbibliothek, *K 9424* et *K 9425*)," signalés par Kaestli et Cherix,[7] à part qu'ils n'ont rien d'inédit.[8]

Mais avant de dresser la liste, qui ne se veut certes pas close,[9] de ces nouveaux folios, nous tenons à souligner que cet étrange texte qui passe tantôt pour un *Évangile* ou une *Apocalypse de Barthélemy*, tantôt pour un *Livre de la Résurrection*, bien loin qu'il soit assimilable au genre apocryphe stricto sensu, pourrait même se révéler un jour comme un simple sermon, dût-il véhiculer des traditions apocryphes plus anciennes. Car, tant qu'aucun titre ni aucun incipit n'aura été retrouvé, le codex C plus complet, sur lequel

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

repose l'édition de Budge,[10] étant lui-même anépigraphe,[11] la prudence reste de mise.

Voici enfin l'identité de nos quatre feuillets, répartis comme il se doit entre leurs codices respectifs:

Codex A

Paris 132[1], f. 40, p. ⲁⲑ-ⲙ, (double Le Caire 8015, codex B);
Paris 132[1], f. 37, p. [ⲡⲍ-ⲡⲏ] (= Budge, p. 27-28).

Codex B

Le Caire 8015[12], p. ⲙⲥ-ⲙⲇ (parallèle dans Paris 132[1], 40[r]);
Vienne K 9574, p. [ⲣⲕⲑ-ⲣⲁ] (= Budge, p. 35-36).

Remarquons pour conclure que le premier fragment du codex A et le premier du codex B qui se recoupent sont d'autant plus intéressants qu'ils correspondent à la partie lacuneuse du codex C et s'avèrent donc inédits à part entière.

Notes

[1] B. Layton, *Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired Since the Year 1906*, Londres 1987, p. 110 et pl. 6/2. Le professeur de Yale était pourtant à un pas de l'identification, ayant reconnu dans le contenu des deux fragments le thème du *Descensus ad inferos*.

[2] J.-D. Kaestli et P. Cherix, *L'Évangile de Barthélemy*, dans la collection de poche "Apocryphes," [Turnhout] 1993, p. 145 sqq. (= *Clavis Apocryphorum* de M. Geerard, N° 80). On ne voit pas pourquoi les auteurs ne citent pas, notamment dans la Bibliographie (p. 249-250), alors qu'ils remontent jusqu'à Dulaurier (1835), l'édition, contemporaine de celle de Lacau (infra, n. 5), de E. Revillout, *Les apocryphes coptes*, I. *Les Évangiles des Douze Apôtres et de S. Barthélemy*, dans "Patrologia Orientalis," t. II/2, Paris 1904.

[3] G. van den Berg-Onstwedder, *A New Fragment of the Apocryphon of Bartholomew the Apostle*, dans "Göttinger Miszellen," Heft 150 (1996), p. 37-41.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 41 et n. 13.

[5] P. Lacau, *Fragments d'apocryphes coptes* (= *Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*, t. IX), Le Caire 1904, p. 23-77 et pl. III-IV.

[6] Il n'est donc pas étonnant que l'auteur ait eu du mal à situer ces fragments par rapport au codex A.

[7] *Op. laud*, p. 147.

[8] Ces deux feuillets viennois ont en effet été publiés, sous le descriptif "Jesus und der Tod," par C. Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts*, IV (= *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*, XV), Leipzig 1914, N° 244a-d, p. 139-142, avec une

"Schriftprobe." Wessely pouvait difficilement avoir connaissance de l'édition de Budge, d'une année antérieure. L'identification proprement dite revient à W. Grossouw (*De apocriefen van het Oude en Nieuwe Testament in de Koptische letterkunde*, in "Studia Catholica," t. X, 1933-1934, p. 444, n. 27), comme l'a bien vu M^me^ van den Berg-Onstwedder (*The Apocryphon of Bartholomew the Apostle*, dans "Sesto congresso internazionale di egittologia," Atti, vol. II, Turin 1993, p. 47-49).

[9] Il y a gros à parier que d'autres feuillets complémentaires seront bientôt exhumés des diverses collections de manuscrits coptes, sans excepter naturellement la B.N. ni le Louvre. Nous-même gardons par devers nous plus d'un fragment, dont l'appartenance aux codices A ou B, sinon à ce même écrit, n'est pas exclue, mais dont la pagination et tout autre repère numérique font désespérément défaut.

[10] E.A.W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, Londres 1913, p. 1-48.

[11] N'oublions pas non plus que le titre "Book of the Resurrection," tiré par Budge directement du manuscrit de Londres Or. 6804 (fol. 23*b*, p. ⲛⲥ̅) et auquel fait écho le colophon (fol. 24*b*), n'est pas une souscription à proprement parler et, partant, ne saurait s'appliquer à la pièce toute entière.

[12] Édité, sans être identifié, par A. Zikri, *Un fragment copte inédit sur la vie du Christ*, dans "Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte," t. 36 (1936), p. 45-48, avec une planche; cf. W.E. Crum, *Coptic Monuments* (= *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, N^os^ 8001-8741*), Le Caire 1902, p. 7.

13, rue de Chantepoulet, CH-1201 *Genève*

MAGIC, MONTANISM, PERPETUA, AND THE SEVERAN PERSECUTION

BY

ANDRZEJ WYPUSTEK

Prior to Decius, that is before the Roman Empire had launched state persecution of Christians, the repressive measures victimising followers of Christianity were usually local and spontaneous outbursts of the heathen mob, or they were the result of the policy of provincial governors heeding popular incriminations at most. This was the reason why the popular image of Christians among pagans was of extreme importance. We should appreciate some additional factors which made accusations of this kind more dangerous than ever in the times of Emperor Severus, at the turn of the second century, inciting the persecution in which popular enmity and official repression went hand in hand.

Septimus Severus himself was ruthless towards magicians, astrologers and prophetic dreams.[1] The Severan lawyer Julius Paulus has left us an outline of legislation afflicting them severely at this time.[2] Even those who merely possessed magic handbooks were threatened with the death sentence. Hitherto, not the magic knowledge as such, but its public display and practice by giving advice were punishable. With Severus, the very *scientia huius artis* was liable to be punished.[3] The range of repression of those accused of magic was extended.[4] There was, of course, no extermination of all involved in magic. Additional circumstances were required to persecute a person as a sorcerer. Apuleius was accused not only of magic doings but of other crimes as well. In the case of Christians, the counterpart of this "additional" crime would be professing a forbidden religion or some other alleged offences such as, for example, *contumacia*. In cases of such "composite" crime, Imperial officials could be relentless, especially when an agitated heathen mob was raging against the Christian wizards. In 1931 a document was found, a circular directed to the στρατηγοί of two Egyptian nomes, probably Heptonomia and Arsinoite, which condemned περιεργίας applied to acquire supernatural knowledge by appeal-

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 276-297

ing to *μαντείας τρόποις*, divination and related artifices (*παγγανίας*, as hapax, corrected by the editor to *μαγγανία*, sorcery).[5] The document was issued by the prefect's office.[6] In the same year Severus paid a visit to Egypt and, in all likelihood, ordered some doctrines of magic and astrology to be removed from the temples.[7]

A new form of Christian faith, Montanism reached ascendancy in the second half of the 2nd century bringing Christians closer to the world of those *superstitiones magicae* in pagan eyes.[8] During this time Montanism reached its climax and owing to fervent believers became conspicuous to its pagan enemies. Pneumatic inspiration, mediumistic enhancements and prophetic trances were experienced not only by Montanus and his prophetesses. Apart from them, and after their time, there were many Montanist seers and visionaries yielding to their *μανία*.[9] Montanists called themselves *πνευματικοί* to emphasise the importance and intensity of their spiritual gifts. This was also, it seems, the spiritual environment of Perpetua's group.[10] Tertullian's visionaries were reminiscent of the Montanist trances. According to Priscilla, sexual continence allows one to see visions and hear voices which are as *salutares* as *occultas*.[11] Ecstatic trances constituted the main reason for dissension between Montanists and Catholics.[12] There are multiple indications that the nature of Montanism made this heresy much more akin to the most dangerous superstitions of the time. Even if it was possible to perceive the faith of Clement of Alexandria, Origen or Valentinus in an unbiased way, the performances of the New Prophecy just could not avoid such associations.

For pagans, superstition was the sign of *delirium, deliramentum*. Cicero saw the menace of superstition in the influence it exercised over the minds of *imbecilli*, who chanced losing their mental balance. To some extent *superstitiosus* means *insanus, insaniens*.[13] In the *Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs* (8) the Roman official appeals: *nolite huius dementiae esse participes*.[14] Montanism perfectly fitted this definition. Tertullian himself spoke of the Montanist ecstasy as resembling madness.[15] Moreover, pagans could easily associate elements of the heretics' conduct with the most dangerous forms of superstition, that is magic and soothsaying. Characteristic terminology of Montanism (*χάρις, δύναμις, πνεῦμα*) is ubiquitous in the magical papyri. The Spirit spoke through Maximilla: "I am word, and spirit, and power."[16] Montanus' prophecy is explicit at this point: "Neither angel nor envoy, but I the Lord God the Father have come." It was God who spoke, the prophet was only his porte-parole.[17] Meanwhile, sorcerers pretended to have so close a relationship to the gods that they were able to achieve full unification with

the deity. They boasted of their prowess in the calling gods, who granted them the knowledge of the future. They incited the gods to enter their hearts, putting themselves or their media into ecstasy or trances.[18] Soothsayers were investigating the future by observing stars, birds or entrails of sacrifices, and, last but not least, by personal, inner revelation during mediumistic trances: *Sin vero more vulgari eum isti proprie magum existimant, qui communione loquendi cum deis immortalibus ad omnia quae velit incredibilia quadam vi cantaminum polleat.*[19] They called gods and demons by rhythmical phrases similar to Montanist prophecies. The similarity of "'I am'" statements in the magical papyri, by which sorcerers assure us to be the voice of god and of the formulas in the Montanist oracles, is striking. "Kindermedien" were often in use. At the same time Tertullian considered Christian children as the best media of God's inspiration and prophecy.[20] This opinion was especially true of Montanists, who brought into practice the prophecies by Joel (2, 28: . . . *et iuvenes visiones videbunt* . . .) concerning the pouring of the Spirit at the end of time (adduced by the Montanist redactor of the *Passio Perpetuae* 1).[21] Montanist glossolalia could bring about the same misunderstandings over the magical use of *voces magicae.*[22] Such misunderstanding is echoed in the words of Celsus who probably spoke of Montanist seers saying: "And each one commonly and customarily says: 'I am God' or 'a son of God,' or 'a divine spirit,' and 'I have come. For the world is already perishing and you, gentlemen, are ruined because of your offences. But I want to save you; and you will see me coming again with heavenly power (δύναμις). Blessed is he who has worshipped me now, but I will cast eternal fire on all the others both in the cities and in the countryside. And men who have not become acquainted with their own recompenses will repent in vain and groan; but I will protect forever those who have obeyed me' [. . .]. After they have brandished these words, they subsequently add words that are unintelligible, and frenzied, and totally obscure, whose meaning no intelligent person could discover, for they are obscure and void of meaning, but they afford opportunity to every fool or sorcerer (γοητής) to appropriate what was said concerning anything in whatever way he wishes."[23] Furthermore, in the magical papyri we find numerous recipes commanding renouncement of meat for the purpose of some rituals.

The same concerned sexual life. Here the Montanists were close to *superstitio* also as they propagated *ieiunia propria* and enjoined sexual abstinence, both requisite to procure visions and appearances, precisely like the magicians did.[24] Moreover, in popular imagination human sacrifice was the regular crime of sorcerers. Philostratus, Tertullian's contemporary, describes

Apollonius of Tyana being accused of killing a child for divination, and the same is told about Didius Julianus.[25] We are thus dealing with a clear association of soothsaying (prophecy?), human sacrifice and magic.[26] Owing to one of the later heresiologists we know that Tertullian had to defend Montanists against this kind of Catholic slander.[27] Around the year 200 Christians themselves accused Montanist prophets of accepting payments and gifts for their spiritual services which made them more akin to sorcerers.[28]

Firmilian of Caesarea gives us a vivid picture of the figure of a charismatic, heretic woman in Cappadocia (c. 230). She came forth in times of frequent earthquakes and other catastrophes. These natural disasters led to the persecution of Christians, accused of causing such afflictions. The prophetess claimed to be ecstatic and promised to make the earth tremble. In the depths of winter she would walk barefooted through frozen snow, without injury or even concern for her health. She would say that she was hurrying to Judea and Jerusalem, purporting to have come from there.[29] Up to the beginning of our century most scholars connected this female miracle-worker with Montanism. P. de Labriolle, the great connoisseur of heresy, was sceptical about her identity as a Montanist visionary. In his opinion the hint of the march to Jerusalem in Palestine put this woman outside the Montanist community which had its holy centre in Pepuza.[30] One can argue for a different view. On these grounds Tertullian himself could not have been a Montanist. He does not mention Pepuza. He believed in the heavenly city descending in Judea, as it was foretold in the Bible.[31] Like the majority of heresies, Montanism was not homogenous in time and space. It was multiform, and the cult of the holy city in Asia Minor is not the best criterion for defining what is and what is not Montanist. In any case, Firmilian's account shows the behaviour of Christians as being at least close to the heresy. And again, causing earthquakes and shaking the elements are the kinds of activities commonly ascribed to sorcerers, as are all the tricks similar to those she boasted of performing or those that were ascribed to her, such as walking through fire, touching glowing coals and walking on water.[32] Eusebius mentioned the widespread report that the Montanist wonder-worker Theodotus was once lifted up into heaven.[33]

It is not accidental that we find important information concerning the place of black magic in the popular imagination and in the civic life of Roman cities in a new-found inscription from Ephesus engraved at the time when Montanism originated, i.e. in the 160's. It contains an oracle

by Apollo.[34] A city (Sardes?) is oppressed by a plague caused by magic. Apollo's oracle commands an appeal to Artemis that a statue of the goddess should be erected in the city in order to free its inhabitants from the grip of the plague (*φάρμακα*), thereby destroying the magical oppression. The inscription was probably engraved after 165, in the time of the great plague brought from Mesopotamia by the troops of Lucius Verus. It confirms that pagans could blame their adversities on sorcery. These were the kind of accusations of which Montanist Christians would be the most likely victims. Heroes of the heresy experienced visions and prophesied while in the eyes of pagans one who knew the future was also able to influence it. When Apollonius of Tyana had foretold calamities for the inhabitants of Ephesus and the prophecy was fulfilled, he was accused of bringing them about. A Montanist prophetess of that time predicted wars and revolutions. She was believed to be the last of the prophets, and after her death the end was sure to come. Another prophetess foretold the imminent descent of heavenly Jerusalem.[35] In the magical papyri we read numerous recipes for prophetic visions in dreams. Many γοητάι claimed not only to be able to foretell future events but also to have the power to change the course of fate by using the spirits of the dead and barbarous sacrifices as well as incantations.[36] The time of the great plague described in the inscription from Ephesus coincided with three events: the origins of Montanism, a dreadful epidemic and remedial measures in the form of public feasts, processions and offerings to gods. On this occasion the inscrutable minority notorious for its neglect of the proper cult of the gods would be particularly suspected of evil spells.[37]

For Christians, the danger came not only from the pagan mob and its imaginary archenemies. Foretelling imminent afflictions must have been treated as the soothsaying *de salute principis vel de summa rei publicae*.[38] In the eyes of Severan governors the authors of such prophecies/divination committed the most dangerous transgression that a soothsayer or an astrologer could commit, that is interfering in political affairs. Montanist Christians produced a considerable number of prophecies contained in their "prophetical books." It was a hazardous activity under Emperor Severus who tended to eradicate the existence of precisely this kind of "magical" writings.[39] The Romans greatly distrusted prophets of all sorts as well as prophetic utterances causing disturbances. The Celts were hated not only for the *immanitas* of their human sacrifices. Their prophets presaged the impending end of the Roman Empire and a new era of Celtic domination. These prophecies were thought to be a serious political threat and were ferociously per-

secuted. The German prophetess Veleda played a significant part in the rebellion of the tribes north of the Rhine against Rome. Apocalyptic visions accompanied Jewish revolts. Native Egyptian traditions influenced the revolt of indigenous peasants during the reign of Marcus Aurelius.[40] At the turn of the 2nd century soothsaying and astrology were closely connected with magic.[41] Philostratus' Nero regarded philosophers as subverters meddling in magic and as soothsayers in disguise. As soon as the term *superstitio* appeared in Cicero, it had strong connotations of divination.[42]

The Montanist communities were founded not only on visionaries and prophets but martyrs as well.[43] Presumably the cult of martyrdom among Montanists ranked higher than among their Catholic opponents. In Montanist communities one probably went as far as to deliberately provoke martyrdom ("voluntary martyrdom" is not the best term as almost every Christian martyrdom in the Roman Empire was voluntary). Surely among them the idea of martyrdom and martyrs themselves were held in the highest esteem, and the inflexibility of the heroes of the faith reached its climax.[44] A *confessor* waiting for his last torment was already an object of genuine veneration. The heroic demeanour of martyrs during their executions was thought to be superhuman, unearthly, impossible to account for without resorting to some form of the divine intervention. Abiding by faith, notwithstanding all suffering and humiliation, was due to the presence of the Holy Spirit in the martyr. Human powers could not assure such great persistence amongst martyrs. In a way martyrs already lived in another world. They felt the living reality of Christ in them: "*Alius erit in me qui patietur pro me . . .*" (*Passio Perpetuae* 5, 2). Martyrs realised the unification of the human and the divine, κοινωνία. They were gifted with charismatic visions, prophetic dreams and superhuman powers. All manifestations of power, such as extraordinary heroism, serenity in the face of death, insensitivity to tortures, veneration amongst coreligionists and the strange behaviour of beasts thrown on Christians as it is described in the *Acts of Martyrs* must have suggested to pagans the image of some exotic γοητεία of the Christian martyrs. These tricks were not efficient enough to save the magician. In fact, in the later *Acts of Martyrs* pagan judges reacted indignantly to the magical tricks by which martyrs helped themselves during torture.[45]

It seems that such accusations proliferated in both Roman Egypt and North Africa (that is in provinces in which Severan persecution was most severe).[46] We also find them in the *Passio Perpetuae*, strongly influenced by Montanism. Miracles that swarm around holy martyrs have their counterparts in contemporaneous magic. There are many spells for obtaining

dream-revelation concerning the future in the magical papyri. Sorcerers are at the same time "prophets."[47] Perpetua is asked to foretell what will happen to the martyrs in the next days (4). Apollonius of Tyana knows in his mind who is good and who is bad. This knowledge is the trademark of a real magician and astrologer, for they know what is in people's hearts and what will be the future fate of an individual.[48] Heroes of Montanism could look into the hearts of men (see *supra, De anima* 9, 4: *corda dinoscit*). In her visions Perpetua "intercedes" to save the soul of her apparently pagan dead brother. The predictive vision is connected here with the miracle of "healing." Perpetua's prayers make Dinocrates safe and free of his terrible illness. To a pagan observer it appeared as healing at a distance connected with predicting man's destiny. This power of martyrs passed on to the objects associated with them. In pagan opinion Christians seemed to use the name of Christ or other Christian signs and symbols, e.g. relics, for magical purposes like exorcisms, healing, divination and magical protection. Perpetua spontaneously uses a formula of this kind: *non me nocebit, in nomine Jesu Christi* (4). Saturus, one of the martyrs, gives a ring immersed his own blood to a newly converted pagan soldier (allusion to the beginning of the cult of relics, 21). Magical rings were one of the regular tools of magic and sorcerers were believed to kill people to collect fresh blood for their operations.[49] In one of the magical papyri there are instructions to submerge a magical tablet in the wound of the executed to make it suitable for spells.[50] What is more important, the converting soldier conceives the religion he will adopt as the religion of "power."[51] Perpetua herself does not feel pain at all during the execution and afterwards is surprised to see the injuries that have been inflicted on her (20). Martyrs retain superhuman forces even when they are profoundly humiliated: "the writer of martyrdom himself holds a somewhat similar belief (i.e. belief similar to pagans believing in the magical flight of Christians) that possibly a woman such as Perpetua could not have been slain unless she herself willed it, because she was feared by the impure spirits."[52] When the first blows struck by an inexperienced gladiator had missed, the martyr herself had to direct the sword to her throat. Owing to the unusual behaviour of beasts released on the martyrs, Saturus returns unharmed from the arena (19). Martyrs causing animals to behave in such a way seemed to act like Orpheus bewitching wild animals. We know that Christians used rings with the image of Orpheus as the sign of Christ.[53] In the Acts of Paul (35-36), contemporary with Perpetua's martyrdom, the heathen mob reacts with the vociferation "down with the sorcerers, down with the

poisoners" to the fact that Paulus avoided injury during a *venatio*.[54] Not only protective magic is involved here, however. A pagan could define the behaviour of Christian martyrs as magically aggressive. Christians of Perpetua's group who rejected the legal procedure and "deserved" punishment and who menaced their persecutors with God's retribution, acted as castors of evil spells.[55] Pagans in Tertullian's Carthage believed Jesus to be a sorcerer.[56] One of the *defixiones* from Carthage (beginning of the 3rd century) bears the name of Jesus.[57] In Tertullian's writings we find confirmation of the vivid fear of sorcerers as they could kill innocent people.[58] The impact of such notions on the minds of inhabitants of Roman Africa and the real anxiety caused by these notions is recognizable in epigraphic sources: an inscription dating back to the beginning of the 3rd century by an officer of the third legion (therefore possibly one of the persecutors of Christians) mourns over his young wife's death caused by magical incantations.[59] Even Christian activities such as a simple prayer could have been treated as an example of potentially dangerous magic. Following some instructions of the New Testament, Christians increasingly practised the silent prayer. In the pagan world the common ground for this procedure was *pudor*. The reason was that silent prayers were prayers with unacceptable or criminal intention, usually connected with magic curses. All this made Christian prayers something suspect and dangerous. Prayers were a speciality of magicians who were men able to say them efficiently. Many *defixiones* are prayers also.[60] Moreover, the considerable length of the prayer is often important in magic—Perpetua prays day and night (7). One of Perpetua's companions, an expectant mother, was upset by the fact that under these circumstances she would not be able to attain martyrdom with all her fellow believers. On account of joint prayer by the martyrs delivery was precipitated (15, 3-5). Also, a considerable number of the magical papyri deals with "uterine magic"; and magicians boast of the capability of keeping the foetus secure, protecting the gestation as well as controlling its length and hastening delivery.[61]

There was something, however, which made the world of Christian prayer and retaliation especially suspect of black magic. Spirits of the dead were reputed to be common instruments of *magia nocens*. For Tertullian *biaeothanati* are the spirits of men condemned to death and of gladiators.[62] Subsequently, for pagans, Christian martyrs who died as suicides ("voluntary martyrdom") or executed criminals, belonged to this category as well.[63] Christians were associated with black magic all the more so when they could appeal to the spirits of martyrs for vengeance as *larvae* or *lemures* etc.

At the same time Montanists were known for their cult of martyrs as well as for their relics and for the sacraments with which they fortified the dead: *Hi mortuos baptizant, publice mysteria celebrant.*[64] Magic objects connected with the dead were of great value—one who possessed them was capable of appealing to the spirits of the dead.[65] Tertullian testifies (*De anima* 57) that magical books circulated at the time spoken of calling *biothanati.* In his *Life of Apollonius* Philostratus emphasises that Achilles' soul was brought from beyond not by necromancy but by simple prayer.[66] In the *Acta Pionii* Pionius notes that only a suicide may be regarded as βιοθανής and is anxious to defend Christian martyrs against such designations.[67] Suicides and criminals (that is Christian martyrs) were often not buried correctly, which made their souls dangerous as *insepulti, innupti* and *biothanati* at once.[68] This far-reaching connection between Christians and the world of the executed or the to-be-executed must have caused alarming associations in the popular mind.

In such a context it does not surprise us to observe pagans considering Christians performers of magical operations in the *Passio Perpetuae.*[69] Perpetua's father seemed to be unable to understand his daughter's conduct. One is inclined to assume that in his view Perpetua would be acting as a person hypnotised by magical incantations. This pagan father could not otherwise account for the nonsensical conduct of his daughter.[70] One of the most important magical "specialisations" was practised by professional hypnotisers.[71] The *tribunus* of the prison where the martyrs were held was anxious about the possible flight of his prisoners with the help of magical operations.[72] To unfetter or escape from jail is one of the common magical tricks.[73] The number of spells in the magical papyri granting liberation from chains and successful escape is startling—could it be that many of the magicians' customers were criminals?.[74] Miracles of this kind were performed by Christian heroes since the very beginning of Christian history (*Acts* 12, 10; 16, 26). In her vision (10) Perpetua hinted at them: . . . *venisse Pomponium diaconum ad ostium carceris et pulsare vehementer. Et exivi ad eum.* . . . Probably the most interesting example of the miraculous/magical escape is the episode in the *Acts of Paul.* Paul, exactly as Perpetua and her friends, is waiting in jail for his execution *ad bestias.* He appeals to his God (in a way which reminds one of a magicians' intimate link with god) conjuring Him up to remove his bonds and to open the gates of the jail.[75] The *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* describes the most contemporarily famous escape by a pagan saint from the hands of justice. The author of the account (also a contemporary of

Perpetua) again emphasizes the fact that it was not a matter of common sorcery.[76]

Septimius Severus' edict prohibiting conversion of pagans to Judaism as well as Christianity, mentioned only once in *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, has become a matter of continuing dispute among scholars.[77] Up to the present time his decision, if it can be believed that *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* is historically trustworthy in this case, was understood as being aimed at Christian proselytism, which was increasingly impetuous at that time. The emperor's act hit Christian catechumens first. In the opinion of K.H. Schwarte the fact that Antoninus Pius forbade the circumcision of pagans (granting the status of the *religio licita* to Judaism) is the real background of Severus' prohibition *Iudaeos fieri.* Severus' move implied the suppression of proselytism, continuing in this way the Empire policy towards Jews. It would thus be only a reinforcement of the already existing legislation.[78] Schwarte admits, however, that the phrasing of the edict is rather unusual and it appears nowhere else in the laws concerning proselytism. To the converted pagan, Jewish proselytism meant, in the proper sense of the word, suffering all consequences of his conversion to Judaism. More importantly, it was also the only possible and "measurable" indication of the potential proselytism. The phrase "to become a Jew" continues to be insufficiently clear because being a new member/adherent of the Jewish community involved many different degrees of affiliation along with loose membership in the form of the vague *θεοσέβεια.* It did not necessarily lead to the abandonment of pagan religion.[79] Perhaps the key to understanding the Severan edict should not primarily be the prohibition of proselytism. Suppression of magic and soothsaying, forms of superstition which, it was presumed, gained souls for both religions, could provide a background for the conduct of Severus and his governors.[80] The domain of "Judaizing," the recourse to magical or soothsaying practices either Jewish or traditionally ascribed to Jews could be involved here.[81] The image of Jews was not the scapegoat fiction alone.[82] There are numerous tablets bearing the names of the Jewish God and His angels. On the tablet from Hadrumetum, probably dating back to the 3rd century, we read a formula calling the God of Israel; this formula seems to be a transcription of a biblical text (for example Is. 21,10).[83] The fame of Jews as sorcerers passed, it seems, on to Christians who were still at that time directly identified or at least connected with Jews. For both the members of the intellectual elite, as well as Celsus, Galen and Cassius Dio, and the governing regime the

difference between Jews and Christians was not distinct. To the pagan mob whether the magicians were Jewish or Christian made no difference at all.[84] We must remember that not only Gentiles could see some sort of "magical religion" in Christianity (or even more so in Christianism). It is not surprising to find many believers described by Tertullian as *simplices, ne dixerim idiotae et imprudentes.*[85] They could not escape their popular, deeply-rooted superstitions. Moreover we know that there were Christians who were astrologers and who did not accept the inconsistency between their practices and the faith they confessed.[86] Surely so called "vulgar Christianity" must have been in its characteristics close to the world of contemporary superstitions, with the result that there were (not few, we suppose) Christians treating the new religion as a kind of new, efficient magic.[87] Such an image of Christianity was very popular among Jews, many of whom became Christian converts.[88] For Christians magical papyri must have been very attractive sometimes as they teemed with names such as Iao, Sabaoth, and with Jewish angels and biblical figures intimate and intelligible to every Christian.

Severus had considerable problems with Jewish perturbations accompanied by prophecies and eschatological tension.[89] Confirmation comes from one of the Egyptian papyri containing a petition by a prominent citizen of Oxyrynchos to Severus and Caracalla (202). The good long-term relationship between this city and Rome was stressed but there was also a hint of the recent Jewish war, in which the city of Oxyrynchos had sided with Rome.[90] At the same time, i.e. after 196 we find in *Digesta* (50, 2, 3) this statement concerning Jews: *Eis, qui Iudaicam superstitionem sequuntur, divi Severus et Antoninus honores adipisci permiserunt, sed et necessitates eis imposuerunt, qui superstitionem eorum non laederent.* Jews as officials could thus be exempted from duties which were inconsistent with their religion. Jerome wrote about Severus and Caracalla: *Iudaeos plurimum dilexerunt.*[91] There were Jews known for their loyalty.[92] At the same time Jews were magicians and soothsayers prone to prophetic agitation and political disturbance. From the point of view of the Roman administration, prophecies circulating among Jews made a difference as they could indeed be dangerous, or at least could appear as such. It seems, then, that one could to some degree distinguish between different Jewish groups. This refers to Christians too, as we have strong evidence in favour of this from the side of the Severan circle at the beginning of the 3rd century, from which some Christians profited.[93] On the other hand, the religion of Montanus seemed to be particularly perilous because of the disquieting relationship between the New Prophecy

among Christians and agitation among Jews. There were probably pagan outbursts directed against Christians as sorcerers. As a result, several strictly connected factors occurred at the same time, the height of Montanism, omnipresent fear of magic and soothsaying, increasing persecution of these *superstitiones*, the edict of Severus (if *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* are true about this point) against Christian and Jewish proselytism, and a wave of persecutions.

Two phenomena coincided at the turn of the 2nd century. Growing hostility, both popular and official, to certain kinds of superstition such as magic and soothsaying, accompanied by the spread of a type of Christianity vividly resembling these perilous doings and leading to fatal misunderstandings. Origen could pay a visit to Julia Mammea c. 232 and Julius Africanus could organise a library for Alexander Severus but to the elite of the Empire as well as in the popular mind the form of Christianity termed Montanism was unacceptable. Perhaps it was especially true of the pagan mob, always eager to ascribe horrible aspects to a new secret cult and to regard it in the worst light. It was this mob that was ever bloodthirsty and ever eager for Christians to be executed.[94] The attitude of the Roman governors was often the result of the behaviour of inhabitants of their province. Of all Christian communities, the Montanist ones were most liable to suffering and most likely to transport the damage to the Catholic Churches. Perhaps we should rethink the old question of the Montanist "voluntary martyrdom." Hitherto it has been believed that if heretics could boast of their numerous martyrs and if the idea of freedom was ranked higher among them than among Catholics, all that was the result of this fervent concept of martyrdom was fostered by them. We should remember, however, that Christians of this kind were the most vulnerable to popular oppression and official persecution.

NOTES

[1] See F.M. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, Philadelphia 1954, especially pp. 208-215.

[2] Paulus, *Sententiae* V, XXI, 1-3; V, XXIII.

[3] *Ibidem*, V, XXIII 18. M. Smith, *Jesus the Magician*, New York 1978, quotations from the German edition, *Jesus der Magier*, München 1981; *idem*, *The Secret Gospel*, New York 1973, p. 221: "while in our culture 'magic' has the connotation of trickery, in Roman culture it often had the connotation of subversion as well"; C.R. Phillips III, Nullum Crimen sine Lege: Socioreligious Sanctions on Magic, in: C.A. Faraone, D. Obbink (ed.), *Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, New York-Oxford 1991, pp. 260-276.

[4] Phillips III, Nullum . . .: ". . . ancients were far more tolerant of unsanctioned religious activity than modern scholars have assumed [. . .] relative infrequency of ancient legislation against unsanctioned religious activity reflects general societal disinterest in repression [. . .]. The sheer bulk of preserved 'magical' papyri and curse tablets argues against any large-scale repressions that have escaped historical notice." There was no need, however, for precise definition (its flexibility instead of granting relative tolerance could bring about unjust, wide-ranging persecution, for example of Christians), nor for special legislation, nor even for repression by order of superior authority to make the accusation of magic occasionally rather perilous. Such was the case of anti-Christian uproars, when the accusation of magic went together with suspicion of other crimes usually connected in popular mind with sorcery. As it was noted by H. Leclerq; "Contre les magiciens on faisait état de tout. Une des accusations portées contre Apulée était la possession d'un miroir . . .," H. Leclerq, Magie, in: F. Cabrol, H. Leclerq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* X 1, Paris 1931, col. 1067-1114 (c. 1092). Note also Apuleius, *Apologia* 54: *Quippe omnibus sic, ut forte negotium magiae facessitur, quicquid omnino egerint obicietur.*

[5] G.M. Parássoglou, Circular from a Prefect: Sileat omnibus perpetuo divinandi curiositas, in: *Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts Published in Honour of H.C. Youtie* I, Bonn 1976, pp. 261-274. *Curiositas divinandi*: L. Desanti, *Sileat omnibus perpetuo divinandi curiositas: indovini e sanzioni nel diritto romano*, Milano 1990; S. Montero, *Política y adivinación en el Bajo Imperio Romano: emperadores y harúspices (193 D.C.-408 D.C.)*, Bruxelles 1991.

[6] The petition to the στρατηγός of Arsinoite (two years later recipient of the circular) dated 22 May 197, is a vivid illustration of the realm repressed by Severan rule. It describes the real onslaught of the sorcery (φθόνος) with the aid of a βρέφος, embryo or new-born child during neighbourly dispute, *Michigan Papyri* VI 423/44, 12-21; commented by H.I. Bell, *Journal of Roman Studies* XXXV 1945, p. 140.

[7] Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae* 76, 13, 2.

[8] The best introduction still by P. de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste*, Paris 1913.

[9] Gregory, *Orationes* 22, 12; Filastrius of Brescia, *Diversarum haereseon* 75; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 3, 4; V 18, 3; V 18, 12-15. Themiso, the author of the "Catholic epistle" must have been regarded to be inspired by the Spirit: A.F. Walls, The Montanist "Catholic Epistle" and its New Testament Prototype, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 88, 1964, pp. 437-446.

[10] Tertullian, *De anima* 9, 4: there is no certitude as for Montanist identification of the woman, but surely most of these phenomena were to be found in the Montanist communities. *Passio Perpetuae* 4, 1: *Et ego quae me sciebam fabulari cum Domino . . .*

[11] Tertullian, *De exhortatione castitatis* 10, 5.

[12] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 22. H. Paulsen, Die Bedeutung des Montanismus für Herausbildung des Kanons, *Vigiliae Christianae* 32, 1978, pp. 19-52 argued against the stereotype of "innovatorische Häresie": we should understand the problem of ecstasy as "Vehikel der Auseinandersetzung" only. W. Schepelern, *Der Montanismus und die Phrygischen Kulte*, Tübingen 1929, p. 134: the condemnation of the Montanist ecstasy as "von kirchlichen Interessen bedingt." Obviously, we should take into account polemical exaggeration of Catholic writers. Our sources, however, reflect the omnipresence of spiritual experiences of this kind among Montanists prophets, ecstatics, martyrs. Tertullian defended ecstasy as *amentia*; at the beginning of the controversy there were numerous

writings on both sides of the conflict concerning the ecstatic prophecy; asceticism of heretics has served for obtaining ecstasy. What else can be viewed as the origin of the controversy? How can we account for the Catholic veto at this point? See also much-telling loci: Epiphanius, *Haereses* 48, 1, 4-48, 2, 1; 48, 12, 1-2; 49, 1-3; Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae* 188, 1.

[13] *Somnia, errores magicos, miracula, sagas nocturnos. Haec omnia ad superstitionem referentur* (Porphyrio, *Ad Horat. Epist.* II 2, 208-209); *Sed superstitiosi vates impudentesque harioli aut inertes aut insani* . . . (Cicero, *De div.* I 132).

[14] R. Freudenberger, Die Akten der scilitanischen Märtyrer als historisches Dokument, *Wiener Studien* 7, 1973, pp. 196-215, especially p. 207.

[15] *Hanc vim ecstasin dicimus excessum sensus et amentiae instar*—Tertullian, *De anima* 45, 3; see also P.C. Mills, *Dreams in Late Antiquity. Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*, Princeton 1994, p. 68.

[16] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16, 17. See the term πνευματόφως in the magical papyri (G. Verbeke, *l'Évolution de la doctrine du pneuma du stoicisme à S. Augustin*, New York, London 1987, p. 330), and Montanus' prophecy; ". . . the just [. . .] will shine a hundred times brighter than the sun, and the little ones among you who are saved will shine a hundred times brighter than the moon," Epiphanius, *Haereses* 48, 10.

[17] Epiphanius, *Haereses* 48, 4 and 11.

[18] A.J. Festugière, *L'idéal religieux des Grecs et l'Évangile*, Paris 1932, pp. 293, 318, 321. There are numerous hints to σύστασις of god and magician in magical papyri; there are ecstasies, hallucinations, seizures of magicians and their media during magical operations. They often lose their self-identity: R. Arbesmann, Fasting and Prophecy in Pagan and Christian Antiquity, *Traditio* VII, 1949-1950, pp. 1-71, especially p. 23. Magical papyri: T. Hopfner, *Griechisch-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, Leipzig 1921-1924; edition by K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, Leipzig-Berlin 1928, 1931, 1941, repr. by A. Heinrichs, Stuttgart 1973-1974. Sorcerers command πνεῦμα to enter their own heart of hearts: *Papyri Graecae Magicae* I 21. We find terms as πνευματοφόροι, ἐνθουσιασμός, ἔκστασις—A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Leipzig 1923, p. 97: "der Gott kommt körperlich in den Menschen hinein." *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 475-830: ecstatic journey to heaven for obtaining immortality; Holy Spirit breathing in man; magician makes Spirit to come upon him, filling his person with its power; deification of the soul *Papyri Graecae Magicae* I 20 ff.; III 600; IV 215 ff.; magician looking for prophetical ecstasy in his flight to heaven *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 732 ff.; "I'm" formula: *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV *passim*; XII, 230-235. See also S. Eitrem, Die σύστασις und der Lichtzauber in der Magie, *Symbolae Osloenses* 8, 1929, pp. 49-53.

[19] Apuleius, *Apologia* 26.

[20] Tertullian, *De anima* 9, 4; *idem*, *Apologeticum* 23; Cyprian, *Epistulae* 16, 4, 1; Apuleius, *Apologia* 12-13; 42-43. *Divinatio per puerum* and ecstasy in magic: A. Abt, *Die Apologie des Apuleius von Madaura und die antike Zauberei*, Berlin 1967, pp. 232-279 (repr. of the first edition, 1908); T. Hopfner, Die Kindermedien in den griechisch-ägyptischen Zauberpapyri, in: *Recueil d'études dédiées à la mémoire de N.P. Kondakov*, Prague 1926, pp. 650-674. See also Schepelern, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-145 ad Epiphanius, *Haereses* 49, 1.

[21] Joel and Montanism: P.C. Atkinson, The Montanist Interpretation of Joel 2:28, 29 (LXX 3:1, 2), *Studia Evangelica* 7, 1982, pp. 11-15.

[22] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16, 7.

[23] Origen, *Contra Celsum* VII 9 (transl. by R.E. Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*, Macon 1989). *Superstitio*, though not mentioned in Paulus' *Sententiae* V, XXI 2 is alluded to here; there is legislation of Marcus Aurelius, *Digesta* 48, 19, 30 which forbids anything that could trouble human minds by superstitious fears. Generalisation of D. Lührmann, Superstitio—die Beurteilung des frühen Christentums durch die Römer, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 42, 1986, p. 195: "*Superstitio* aber war kein strafrechtliches Delikt" seems to be inaccurate.

[24] Tertullian, *De exhortatione castitatis* 10, 5.

[25] Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* VII 20; Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae* 73, 16.

[26] Tertullian, *Adversus nationes* I 7, 31. See F.J. Dölger, Sacramentum infanticidii. Die Schlachtung eines Kindes und der Genuß seines Fleisches und Blutes als vermeintlicher Einweihungsakt im ältesten Christentum, *Antike und Christentum* 4, 1934, especially p. 217. The scene of disguising Christians as priests of Saturn in the *Passio Perpetuae* 18 should be understood as an attempt to manifest their imaginary crime of human sacrifices, see A. Wypustek, The Problem of Human Sacrifices in Roman North Africa, *Eos* LXXXI, 1993, pp. 263-280; A. MacGovan, Eating People: Accusations of Cannibalism Against Christians in the Second Century, *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2, 1994, pp. 413-442, especially p. 430.

[27] . . . *Montanum defendit* (scil. *Tertullianus*), *agens contra Soterem supra dictum urbis papam, asserens falsa esse de sanguine infantis* . . ., Praedestinatus, *Praedestinatorum haeresis* 1, 26. Magicians use also *τυρομαντεία*: in *Papyri Graecae Magicae* there is spell—*λόγος τοῦ ἀρτοτύρου* (see *Papyri Graecae Magicae* V 185-211). The name of Montanist heresy in Epiphanius (*ἀρτοτυρῖται*, *Haereses* 49, 1) could be defaming, on account of the use of *ἀρτοτύρος* in magic, formulation of Catholic writers: E. Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, Rom, Freiburg und Wien 1959, pp. 333-335. In one of Perpetua's visions "Eucharist" is dispensed in the form of cheese (*Passio Perpetuae* 4). See also *Papyri Graecae Magicae* XX describing magical ritual similar to Montanist "mystery" in Epiphanius, *Haereses* 49, 2.

[28] For example Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* XVIII 2, XVIII 6 and 11. "Un grief fréquent à l'adresse des magiciens stigmatise leur cupidité"—some useful examples in G. Poupon, L'accusation de magie dans les Actes apocryphes, in: E. Bovon (*et alii*, ed.), *Les Actes apocryphes des apôtres*, Paris 1981, pp. 71-93, especially p. 79. See also Ulpianus, *Digesta* I 3, *De extr. cognit.* 13.

[29] Firmilian of Caesarea apud Cyprian, *Epistula* 75, 10.

[30] Labriolle, *La crise* . . ., p. 487.

[31] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* III 24. See H.J. Lawlor, The Heresy of the Phrygians, *Journal of Theological Studies* 9, 1908, pp. 481-499 on the multi-faceted Montanism.

[32] Numerous examples in: T. Hopfner, Mageia, in: F. Pauly, G. Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* XXVIII, 1928, col. 301-395.

[33] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16, 14.

[34] F. Graf, An Oracle against Pestilence from a Western Anatolian Town, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 92, 1992, pp. 267-279.

[35] Epiphanius, *Haereses* 48, 2, and 49, 1.

[36] Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* V 12; VIII 7.

[37] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 26, 5; M. Sordi, I "Nuovi Decreti" di Marco Aurelio contro i Cristiani, *Studi Romani* IX, 1961, pp. 365-378. M. Guarducci, L'Italia e Roma in una tabula defixionis greca recentemente scoperta, *Bulletino della Commisione Archeologica Comunale in Roma* LXXIV, 1951-1952, pp. 57-70 on wide-ranging spells.

[38] Tertullian, *De ieiunio* 13, 5: *Spiritus sanctus, cum in quibus vellet terris per quos vellet praedicaret, ex providentia imminentium sive ecclesiasticarum temptationum sive mundialium plagarum, qua paracletus id est advocatus. . . .*

[39] Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* 3, 2. W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 10), Tübingen 1934, p. 167 regarding Julius Africanus' purchase of books of Egyptian magic while visiting the Catechetical School at Alexandria.

[40] Tacitus, *Historiae* IV 54, 2; Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae* 71, 4; prophecies among Jews: Joseph Flavius, *Bellum Judaicum* 6, 312; Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, Vespasianus 4, 5; Tacitus, *Historiae* V 13. On trials of soothsayers Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* VII 11 and 20. Latest studies of the theme: M.T. Fögen, *Die Enteignung der Wahrsager. Studien zum kaiserlichen Wissenmonopol in der Spätantike*, Frankfurt am Main 1993; D. Potter, *Prophets and Emperors. Human and Divine Authority from Augustus to Theodosius*, Harvard-Cambridge 1994, especially pp. 171-182.

[41] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 23, 1; 35, 12; ibidem 43: magicians and astrologists may complain of the lack of earnings they can get from Christians for their service—one is allowed to suspect that for these pagans Christian Church was a rival, magical association.

[42] W. Belardi, *Superstitio*, Roma 1976.

[43] The accusation bulks large on Christian apocryphal writings of the 2nd and 3rd century and later hagiography: S. Prete, Some loci in Ancient Latin Hagiography, in: *The Heritage of the Early Church. Essays in Honour of G.V. Florovsky*, Rome 1973, pp. 307-319. In the *Acts of Scillitan Martyrs* we meet probably the first trace of these accusations as directed against African Christians; G. Bonner, The Scillitan Saints and the Pauline Epistles, *Journal of Ecclesiastical Studies* 7, 1956, pp. 141-146; the best edition and fullest commentary: F. Ruggiero, Atti dei Martiri Scilitani. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento, *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Linzei* 1991, CCCLXXXVIII, IX, v. 1, 2, pp. 39-118. Freudenberger, *op. cit.*, on probably Montanist (surely radical) influences (*Acta* 6).

[44] S. Ronchey, *Indagine sul martirio di san Policarpo*, Roma 1990, pp. 33-91; J.D. Tabor, A.J. Droge, *A Noble Death. Suicide and Martyrdom among Christians and Jews in Antiquity*, San Francisco 1992, pp. 138-140, 152-155; G. Buschmann, *Martyrium Polycarpi. Eine formgeschichtliche Studie*, Berlin-New York 1994 *passim; idem*, Martyrium Polycarpi 4 und der Montanismus, *Vigiliae Christianae* 49, 1995, pp. 105-145, against W. Tabbernee, Montanism and Voluntary Martyrdom, *Colloquium. The Australian Theological Review*, 17, 2, 1985, pp. 33-44.

[45] Examples in Leclerq, *op. cit.*, col. 1086-1087. For Origen (*Contra Celsum* I 31) there is some power in the death of the just dying voluntary death for our good; it drives away maleficient spirits that cause plagues, droughts, storms and other calamities.

[46] In the *Passio Perpetuae* (21) the pagans seeing a martyr bathed in blood shout ironically: *Salvum lotum! Salvum lotum!* Numerous *bene lava, salvum lotum* inscriptions in the surroundings of *piscinae* and baths with other magical, apotropaic signs do not seem to be not only neutral greetings. Bathing was regarded, as it seems, as something in the need of the magical protection. In John Chrysostom's *In Acta homiliae* 10, 5 Christians crossing themselves while entering the baths: F.J. Dölger, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzeichens VII, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 8/9, 1965/1966, pp. 28-52. On *salvum lotum*: F.J. Dölger, Gladiatorenblut und Martyrerblut. Eine Szene der Passio

Perpetuae in kultur- und religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung, *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* 1923-1924 (1926), pp. 196-214. The Montanists themselves restrained from public baths, Tertullian, *De ieiunio* 1. Baths in the Christian opinion: J. Amat, *Songes et visions. L'au-delà dans la littérature latine tardive*, Paris 1985, p. 172.

[47] As an instance *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 3172-3208; V 370-446; VII 222-249, 255-259, 359-369, 478-490, 664-686, 703-726, 727-739, 740-755, 795-845, 1009-1016; VIII 64-110; XII 190-192; XIIb 27-3, 32-35. See also S. Eitrem, Dreams and Divination in Magical Ritual, in: *Magika*..., pp. 175-187; many Christians believed in some kind of dream divination, Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 23, 1. Prophetic gifts of magicians: Philostratus, *Vita Apolonii* I 12; IV 4, 18, 24; V 11, 24, 30; VI 32; Celsus, see *supra Papyri Graecae Magicae* VII 327 ff. is the spell for opening ears to hear the voice of god foretelling the future fate of the person resorting to magic; *Papyri Graecae Magicae* XXXc asks if the questioner will recover from illness.

[48] Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* I 10, *Papyri Graecae Magicae* III 327. *Διάκρισις* of magicians and their prescience of the future fate of the individuals: *Papyri Graecae Magicae* III 263 ff.; III 459; V 213 ff.: prayer of magicians should ensure the knowledge of the future condition of the dead persons' souls (285-301); XIa 25; XIII 611; 710 ff.

[49] See F.J. Dölger, Gladiatorenblut...; C.D.G. Müller, Von Teufel, Mittagsdämon und Amuletten, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 17, 1974, s. 91-95: association of demons and Ethiopians is probably the result of the vision of Egypt as the terra electionis of magic. In one of her visions Perpetua is fighting with an Ethiopian, symbolising the devil (*Passio Perpetuae* 10). The figure of the good shepherd appearing in the Perpetua's vision in the context of apotropaic magic: J. Quasten, Der gute Hirte in frühchristlicher Totenliturgie und Grabeskunst, *Miscellanea G. Mercati* I, Vaticano MCMXLVI, pp. 373-406 (Studi e Testi 121).

[50] *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 2145-2240, especially 2164-2170. See also *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 435 and 449, some other late examples G. Marasco, Pagani e cristiani di fronte alle arti magiche nel IV secolo d. C.: il caso di Atanasio, *Quaderni Catanesi* III 1991-1995, pp. 111-134, especially p. 117.

[51] *Ibidem* 9: *... nos magnificare coepit intellegens magnam virtutem* [Greek version: *δύναμιν μεγάλην*] *esse in nobis....*

[52] F.C.R Thee, *Julius Africanus and the Early Christian View of Magic*, Tübingen 1984, p. 420; *Passio Perpetuae* 21, 10: *Fortasse tanta femina aliter non potuisset occidi, quae ab immundo spiritu timebatur, nisi ipsa voluisset.* Almost complete bibliography of the *Passio*: P. Habermehl, *Perpetua und der Ägypter oder Bilder des Bösen im frühen afrikanischen Christentum. Ein Versuch zur Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, Berlin 1992 (Texte und Untersuchungen 140), pp. 250-280.

[53] Clement, *Paedagogus* 3, 11.

[54] See W. Schubart, *Prakseis Paulou*, Glückstadt-Hamburg 1936 (Veröffentlichungen aus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek II), pp. 38, 127. Sorcerers enchanting wild animals: Pseudo-Justin, *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* 24; magicians understand the language of animals: Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* I 20; III 9.

[55] *Passio Perpetuae* 18, 8: *Dehinc, ut sub conspectu Hilariani pervenerunt, gestu et nutu coeperunt Hilariano dicere: "Tu nos," inquiunt, "te autem Deus."* Threats during *cena ultima*: 17, 2-3. In *defixiones* and papyri we find hundreds of aggressive spells and threats, often called *διαβολή*, e.g. *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 2478 ff.; IV 2654 ff.: the one for whom the divine anger is intended is shown as slanderer accusing the drawer of the spell of murder and

cannibalism, exactly as it was with Christians in the pagan eyes! Compare Eitrem S., Die rituelle ΔΙΑΒΟΛΗ, *Symbole Osloenses* 2, 1924, s. 43-58; A. Audollent, *Defixionum tabellae*, Paris 1904, n. 295 (the magical tablet from Hadrumetum, directed to some chthonic deity: *tibi commendo quoniam maledixit parturientem*).

[56] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 23, 12.

[57] R. Wünsch, *Antike Fluchtafeln* (H. Lietzmann, Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 20), Bonn 1912, pp. 13-21, n. 4 (resorting to a *νεκυδαίμων*). In v. 21 we read *ὁρκίζω Ἰσοῦ* (= *Ἰησοῦ*).

[58] Tertullian, *De virginibus velandis* 15, 1; *idem, De spectaculis* 2, 8; *De pudicitia* 5, 11.

[59] *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* VIII 2756: . . . *carminibus defixa [. . .] cuius admissi vel Manes vel Di caelestes erunt sceleris vindices*. . . . See Y. Le Bohec, *La troisième Légion auguste*, Paris 1989, p. 141. Some scholars believed in the existence of allusions to Christian sorcerers in Apuleius; these hypothesis seems to be not very likely: A.R. Birley, *Septimius Severus, the African Emperor*, London 1971, pp. 32-33; T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study*, Oxford 1971, pp. 60, 272-273.

[60] *Papyri Graecae Magicae* XII 189. Sorcerers praying silently; Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* II 28; *Apologia* 54, 7: See Baldini Moscati, "Murmur" nelle terminologia magica, *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* N.S. 48, 1974, pp. 254-262; H.S. Versnel, Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer, in: *idem* (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1981, pp. 1-64 ("offensive prayers," "Gebetsegoismus"); P.W. van der Horst, Silent Prayer in Antiquity, *Numen* 41, 1994, pp. 1-25.

[61] J.-J. Aubert, Threatened Wombs: Aspects of the Uterine Magic, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 30, 1989, pp. 421-449.

[62] Tertullian, *De anima* 57, 3: *quod credibile videatur eas potissimum animas ad vim et iniuriam facere quas per vim et iniuriam saevus et inmaturus finis extorsit, quasi ad vicem offensae*. Origen, *Contra Celsum* II 51: magic is the power of the spirits, thanks to magical incantations doing what they are told to do by sorcerers. In Africa the spirits of the dead competitors (*animae huius loci* in the massive grave near the Carthage's amphitheatre) were most useful in black magic. Note also Tertullian, *De anima* 10, 16; Origen, *Contra Celsum* III 23; Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* XXVIII 2, 1. Revenge of the dead suicide's soul: Plutarch, *Quaestiones graecae* 12, causing the terrible famine. See also Horace, *Epodae* V 92: the soul of the child killed by sorcerers will persecute them after child's death. Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 9: Christian rites are concerned with the cult of the dead criminal and with the adoration of the instrument of his torture. Resorting to spirits of the dead as *familiares*—Tertullian, *De anima* 57, 1 and 3; *immaturi* avenging themselves *ibidem* 57, 4; appealing to the dead for *divinatio* 57, 2 and 6. The spirits concerned are usually those of dead gladiators, *bestiarii* (Tertullian, *De anima* 57, 5).

[63] Dölger, Sacramentum . . ., pp. 188-228; J.H. Waszink, Mors immatura, *Vigiliae Christianae* 3, 1949, pp. 107-11; A.D. Nock, Tertullian and the ahori, in: *idem, Essays on religion and the Ancient World* II, Massachusetts 1972, pp. 712-719. See also F.J. Dölger, Antike Parallelen zum leidenden Dinocrates in der Passio Perpetuae, *Antike und Christentum* 2, 1930, s. 1-40 and E. Jobbé-Duval, *Les morts malfaisants, "larvae," "lemures," d'après le droit et les croyances populaires romaines*, Paris 1924; J. Amat, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-277, the fear of the avenge by *larvae* and *lemures* pp. 32-33; 266-269.

[64] Philostratus, *Diversarum haereseon* 49; H. Grégoire, Inscriptions montanistes et novatiennes. L'Ascension avec les saints et le baptême des morts, *Byzantion* VIII, 1933, pp. 58-65. See also A. Strobel, Das heilige Land der Montanisten, Berlin-New York 1980,

pp. 244-247: in the *Passio Perpetuae* (VII 2) there should be clear allusion to this habit: in Perpetua's vision all blessings of baptism are given to her dead brother.

[65] By way of example Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* III 17. In the *Martyrium Polycarpi* 13, 2 the faithful want to touch martyr's body before his death; 18, 2 magical overtones in the cult of relics.

[66] Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* IV 16.

[67] *Acta Pionii* 13. The opinion of the pagan in Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 9, 4; 29, 2-3 and slanders of Jews in the *Acta Pionii* 13, 3 (L. Robert, *Le martyre de Pionios, prêtre de Smyrne*, Dunbarton Oaks 1994 pp. 84-89) are testimonies of the discussion between Christians, pagans and Jews concerning imaginary appealing to the soul of Christ as *noxius*. The opposition of the Church to the pursuit of martyrdom could be conditioned by such accusations. Christians in Tertullian's Carthage fostered almost pagan beliefs concerning the fate of souls after death: they probably believed them to remain at the grave of the dead, G. Quispel, African Christianity before Tertullian, in: *Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia J.H. Waszink oblata*, Amsterdam 1973, pp. 275-279 (on Tertullian's *De res.* 17: *vulgus existimat*...). As for the date of this martyrdom P. Keresztes, Marcus Aurelius a Persecutor?, *Harvard Theological Review* 61, 1968, pp. 321-34 is advocating for a datation close to the beginnings of Montanism, though "controversy here [...] seems to be unending."

[68] F. Cumont, *Lux Perpetua*, Paris 1949, pp. 34, 78-108, 318-320, 339. H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy. Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*, Paris 1978, pp. 208-209 on the ceremonial of the necromancers, who poured into the graves wine, oil, milk and honey (which played an important part in Christian life and imagination!). p. 209, n. 136: "Because of his 'voluntary death' the Chaldean initiate may be ranged in the category of those who have committed suicide." Perhaps one should invoke here Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam* 3, 1. *Sub Hilariano praeside, cum de areis sepulturarum nostrarum adclamasset: "Areae non sint!" Areae ipsorum non fuerunt*; see also *Apologeticum* 37.

[69] In a mixed family even far more innocent conduct led to the suspicion of magic: Tertullian, *Ad uxorem* 2, 5. Another examples from Carthage: Amat, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-196, and *passim*.

[70] Heroines of Christian popular literature rejected the authority of fathers and husbands, exactly as Perpetua did. Some pagans were eager to ascribe their scandalous behaviour to the magical knowledge of Christians: J. Anson, The Female Transvestite in Early Monasticism: the Origin and Development of a Motif, *Viator. Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 5, 1974, pp. 1-11 (Thecla's conduct related to Montanus's statements, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 18, 2-3); Poupon, *op. cit.*, as for accusations of hypnotising wives and concubines. The African (mid of the 3rd century) *Passio Lucii et Marciani* describes two magicians, future Christian martyrs resorting to the love-charme. Possibly the strange episode in the *Passio Perpetuae* 3, 1-3 may be better understood in the context of the magic of *fascinatio* and of the magical love spells; Perpetua's father jumps at his daughter *ut oculos mihi erueret*. On the whole episode see A. Kessler, Der Angriff auf die Augen Perpetuas. Versuch einer Deutung von Passio Perpetuae 3, 3, in: A. Kessler, T. Ricklin, G. Wurst (ed.), *Peregrina Curiositas. Zu Ehren D. van Damme*, Freiburg 1994, pp. 191-201. Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 23, 1, *De anima* 57, 8 and as for *caecitas* brought about by daemons *ibidem* 57, 6. *Fascinatio: De virginibus velandis* 15, 1, 2; *De carne Christi* 2, 2. See also J. Perkins, The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles and the Early Christian Martyrdom, *Arethusa* 18, 1985, pp. 211-230.

[71] Relevant loci in Hopfner, Mageia . . ., col. 381.

[72] *Passio Perpetuae* 16: . . . *cum a tribuno castigatius eo tractantur, quia ex admonitionibus hominum vanissimorum verebatur ne subtraherentur de carcere incantationibus aliquibus magicis* . . . A.A.R. Bastiaensen, Commento alla Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis, in: *idem*, (*et alii*, ed.), *Atti e Passioni dei Martiri*, Roma 1987, pp. 412-452, ad *Passio Perpetuae* 16 pp. 441-442 (*quia [. . .] castiganti [. . .] tractanti?*).

[73] Clement, *Recognitiones* II 32; Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* VII 38.

[74] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 208. For example *Papyri Graecae Magicae* XII 160 ff.; XIII 290-296 (resorting to Christ); *Papyri Graecae Magicae* XXXVI 311-320; compare Origen, *Contra Celsum* II 34 for Celsus' remarks concerning magical deliveries in Christian literature. Charms for escape: *Papyri Graecae Magicae* I 101-103, 196 ff.; IV 2145 ff.; V 486 etc.

[75] W. Schubart, *Prakseis* . . ., especially pp. 32-39 (*Acts of Paul* 10-35). See also; O. Weinreich, Gebet und Wunder. Zwei Abhandlungen zur Religions- und Literaturgeschichte, in: *Genethliakon W. Schmid*, (Tübingen Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 5), Stuttgart 1929, repr. in *idem, Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, Darmstadt 1968, pp. 39-298.

[76] *Vita Apollonii* VII 38-39; VIII 5.

[77] *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Sewer 17, 1; *Iudaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit.* M. Sordi, *Il cristianesimo e Roma*, Bologna 1965, pp. 221-225, commenting the passus: ". . . che senso avrebbe avuto infatti una disposizione imperiale comminante gravi pene a chi 'diveniva' cristiano, quando la professione stessa di cristianesimo era punita fin dal I secolo?" is not convincing in her doubt. Laws against sorcery, soothsaying, human sacrifices were repeatedly enacted.

[78] K.H. Schwarte, Das angebliche Christengesetz des Septimius Severus, *Historia* 12, 1963, pp. 185-208.

[79] S.J.D. Cohen, Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew, *Harvard Theological Review* 82, 1989, pp. 13-33 on grades of conversion to Jewish religion; Y. Baer, Israel, the Christian Church, and the Roman Empire from the Time of Septimius Severus to the Edict of Toleration of A.D. 313, *Scripta Hierosolymitanea* 7, 1961, pp. 79-145, on persecution of Jews under Severus p. 84, note 14. On proselytism see: P.W. van der Horst, Jews and Christians in Aphrodisias in the Light of their Relations in other cities of Asia Minor, in: *idem, Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*, Freiburg-Göttingen 1990, pp. 166-181 and P. van Minnen's critical remarks, Drei Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des Judentums in der griechisch-römischen Welt, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 100, 1994, pp. 253-258.

[80] In *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* the magical fame of Egyptians in connection with Christians and Jews is underlined. It reads like the commentary to the circular from 199: Egyptians are *versificatores, epigrammatarii, mathematici, haruspices, medici. Nam in eis Christiani, Samaritae et quibus praesentia semper tempora cum enormi libertate displiceant* (Firmus, Saturninus, Proculus, Bonosus 8, 2-3); *Illic qui Serapem colunt Christiani sunt, et devoti sunt Serapi qui se Christi episcopos dicunt. Nemo illic archisynagogus Iudaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes. Ipse ille patriarcha cum Aegyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Christum* (*ibidem* 9, 4). Important fact is that since the beginning of the 3rd century Coptic christianity (deeply involved in magical lore) gained still more and more converts! See H.I. Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Liverpool 1953, pp. 88-89.

[81] Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 22, 8, 22; Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 5, 15. Josephus Flavius is said to have predicted the future to Vespasianus, *Bellum Iudaicum* 6, 5, 4. See,

for example, *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 3079, an incantation beginning with the name of Jesus, the God of the Hebrew, forbids the consumption of... pork: M. Philonenko, Une prière magique au Dieu créateur (*Papyri Graecae Magicae* V 459-489), *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 1985, pp. 433-452. W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church. A Study of Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus*, Oxford 1965, p. 302 on "the career of Blastus who seems to have been a Roman Montanist, but was also regarded as a 'judaizer.' He was an opponent of the Roman presbyter Gaius and leader of the pro-14 Nisan group among the Roman Christians from Asia."

[82] The God of the Bible has forbidden the practice of divination, soothsaying, necromancy, sorcery (V.J.J. Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*, Princeton 1991, pp. 13-35), but we know that Jews in fact have meddled in magic, M.A. Morgan (tr.), *Sefer-ha Razim*, Chico 1983. See also J. Goldin, The Magic of Magic and Superstition, in: E.S. Fiorenza (ed.), *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, Indiana 1976, pp. 115-147. According to Smith, *Jesus*..., pp. 110-113 the famous Palatin graffito (circa 220?) echoes the pagan raillery at Christian magic, as well as the episode described by Tertullian (*Ad nationes* 1, 14-15, *Apologeticum* 17, 12). Important reservations against such conclusions are thus neglected: A. Procopé-Walter, Iao und Set, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 30, 1933, pp. 34-69 ("keine sichere Deutung"; E. Bickermann, Ritualmord und Eselkult, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 71, NF 35, 1927, pp. 171-187 and 255-264, repr. *idem, Studies in Jewish and Christian History* IX, Leiden 1971.

[83] Commented by M. Simon, *Verus Israël. Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire romain (135-425)*, Paris 1948, pp. 394-431.

[84] Tertullian, *Adversus nationes* 1, 14: *Aliud genus* (sc. *Iudaei*) *seminarium est infamiae nostrae.* Some other instances W.H.C. Frend, A Severan Persecution? Evidence of the Historia Augusta, in: *Forma Futuri. Studi in onore M. Pellegrino*, Turin 1975, pp. 470-480; *idem*, Open Questions Concerning the Christians and the Roman Empire in the Age of the Severi, *Journal of Theological Studies* 25, 1974, s. 333-351; *idem*, Jews and Christians in Third Century Carthage, in: *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Mélanges offerts à M. Simon*, Paris 1978, pp. 185-194.

[85] Tertullian, *De resurrectione* 2, 11; *idem, Adversus Praxean* 3, 1.

[86] Tertullian, *De idololatria* 9, 1-9, 7, commented by L. Koep, Astrologia usque ad Evangelium concessa (zu Tertullian, *De idololatria* 9) in: *Mullus, Festschrift Klauser*, Münster 1964, pp. 199-208.

[87] Hippolytus, *Comm. in Dan.* 4, 20: Montanist practices as popular among Christians of lower origin and education, giving heed to dreams, fables and silly tales instead of the Bible. For Hippolytus Montanism is something like "vulgar Christianity." Similarily Origen, *De principiis* 2, 7, 3: *Quas divisiones ac differentias non advertentes hi, qui "paracletum" eum in evangelio audiunt nominari, neque considerantes ex quo opere vel actu "paracletus" nominetur, vilibus eum nescio quibus spiritibus compararunt et per hoc conturbare conati sunt ecclesias Christi...*, what seems to reflect the connection of the heresy with magic as existing not only in pagans' view, but in the eyes of Churchmen too. On the whole problem see: H.J. Carpenter, Popular Christianity and the Theologians in the Early Centuries, *Journal of Theological Studies* 14, 1963, pp. 294-310; N. Brox, Der einfache Glaube und die Theologie, *Kairos* 14, 1972, pp. 161-187; D.L. Paulsen, Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses, *Harvard Theological Review* 83, 1990, pp. 105-116. One of the most interesting, early instances of Christian magic is a papyrus

dating from the reign of Severus (circa 220), sample of Christian "Zaubergebet für Gesundheit," O. Stegmüller, *Berliner Klassikertexte aus dem staatlichen Museen zu Berlin* VIII, Berliner Septuagintafragmente, Berlin 1939, pp. 50-55; C.H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, London 1979, pp. 82-83.

[88] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 21, 17.

[89] Under 197 Eusebius' *Chronika: Iudaicum et Samariticum bellum motum*; Orosius, *Historia adversus paganos* 7, 17, 3; *Oracula Sibyllina* VIII 138-159; *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Severus 16, 7. The tension well summed up by Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 3, 24, 2: *De restitutione vero Iudaeae, quam et ipsi Iudaei ita ut describitur sperant, locorum et regionum nominibus inducti, quomodo allegorica interpretatio in Christum et in ecclesiam et habitum et fructum eius spiritaliter competat. . . .*

[90] B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt (ed.), *The Oxyrynchos Papyri* IV, London 1904, n. 705, pp. 162-168, discussed are verses 31-35: J.S. Thompson, *Aufstände und Protestaktionen im Imperium Romanum. Die Severischen Keiser im Spannungsfeld innenpolitischer Krise*, Bonn 1990, pp. 203-207.

[91] Jerome, *In Dan.* 11, 34.

[92] Frend, Open . . .; M. Sordi, Giudea—Siria Palestina all'epoca di Settimio Severo, *Bolletino di Studi Latini* 1, 1971 pp. 251-255.

[93] For example Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam* 4, 6-7. J. Massingberd Ford, Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian Heresy?, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* XVII, 2, 1966, pp. 145-158 as for similarity between Jewish and Montanist communities.

[94] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 37, 1-3.

Kamienna 29/55, 53-307 *Wrocław*, Poland

THE PROTONIKE LEGEND, THE *DOCTRINA ADDAI* AND BISHOP RABBULA OF EDESSA[1]

BY

JAN WILLEM DRIJVERS

The Protonike legend tells the story of the discovery of the True Cross. Besides the Protonike legend two other versions of this story were known in Late Antiquity: the Helena legend and the Judas Kyriakos legend. Each version is named after its principal person. The Helena legend is the original from which the Kyriakos- and Protonike legends are derived. This legend reports how Helena, mother of Constantine the Great, came to Jerusalem to search for the Cross on which Jesus Christ was crucified. When three crosses were found the Cross of Christ was identified with the help of Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, through a healing or resuscitation miracle. At the site where the Cross was discovered, a wonderful church was built, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Part of the Cross was kept in this church. Besides the Cross, the nails with which Christ's body was hammered to the Cross were also found. These were sent to Constantine. Some were used to make a horse's bridle, others were added to the emperor's helmet, thereby fulfilling the prophecy of Zechariah 14:20. The first surviving testimony for this version of the legend can be found in Ambrose's funeral oration for Theodosius the Great which dates from 395. However, it is known that the legend was first committed to writing in *c.* 390 by Gelasius of Caesarea, who incorporated the story in his now lost *Church History*.[2] At the beginning of the fifth century the Greek text of the legend as written down by Gelasius was translated into Latin by Rufinus and included in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.[3] It is generally assumed that Rufinus' text renders that of Gelasius faithfully.[4] The "Urtext" of Gelasius/Rufinus was the beginning of a series of texts in Greek and Latin which in essence are all the same and which constitute the Helena legend.[5]

The Judas Kyriakos legend is in fact a development of the Helena legend. Helena still plays an important role in this version, but it is not she who finds the Cross and afterwards the nails, but the discovery is made by the

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997
Vigiliae Christianae 51, 298-315

Jew Judas. After his discovery Judas converts to Christianity, adopts the name Kyriakos ("of the Lord") and afterwards becomes bishop of Jerusalem. The Kyriakos version is characterized by a vehement anti-Judaism which may be one of the reasons for the story's great popularity in the Western and Byzantine Middle Ages.[6]

The Protonike version differs considerably from the Helena and Kyriakos version of the legend of the discovery of the Cross. The two main differences are that the event of the discovery of the Cross is situated in the first century C.E. and that Helena as principal person of the legend is replaced by the empress Protonike, wife of the emperor Claudius.[7] Protonike is clearly a fictional person. Her name has a symbolic meaning; it signifies "first victory" and stands for the first victory over pagans and especially Jews. Yet in spite of the differences the Protonike legend is still closely related to the original traditions of the *inventio crucis*, as the following summary makes clear.

Protonike, the wife of the emperor Claudius, when "Simon Peter one of the disciples was in the city of Rome, saw the signs and wonders and astonishing powers which he performed in the name of the Messiah [and] recanted the paganism of her fathers in which she lived." She held the Messiah in great honor. She also wished to see Jerusalem and went there together with her two sons and her one virgin daughter. In Jerusalem she was visited by James, leader of the church of that city. Protonike asked him to show her Golgotha, the wood of the cross and Christ's tomb. James replied that these "are under the authority of the Jews . . . and [they] do not permit us to go and pray there before Golgotha and the grave." The Jews, said James, "persecute us so that we do not preach or proclaim in the name of the Messiah." Protonike ordered the leaders of the Jews to deliver Golgotha, the grave and the cross to James and his followers. Later, when this was done, she entered Christ's tomb where she found three crosses, one belonging to Christ and the other two belonging to the brigands who were crucified with him. The moment she entered the tomb "her virgin daughter fell down and died without pain, illness or any cause of death." The empress immediately started to pray. Then her oldest son said to her: "Listen to what I have to say, your majesty. In my mind and reasoning this sudden death is not in vain; it was rather a marvelous visitation by which God could be glorified. . . . By the death of my sister we are able to perceive and learn which cross is the Messiah's because the Messiah will not turn away from those who believe in and seek him." Protonike recognized that her son had spoken wisely. She took one of the

crosses, placed it upon her dead daughter and began to pray: ". . . let my daughter live and arise that your name might be glorified by her when her soul returns to her body. May those who crucified you be ashamed and may those who worship you rejoice." When this had no effect she took the second cross, put it upon the corpse of her daughter and prayed again. The second cross too did not bring the girl back to life. When, however, Protonike put the third cross upon her daughter "immediately, in that instant, in the twinkling of an eye, as the cross touched the corpse of her daughter, her daughter came back to life, suddenly arose, and glorified God who had restored her to life by his cross." When thus the True Cross was recognized, Protonike gave it to James to keep it in great honour. She also ordered that a church be built over Golgotha and the tomb in order that these places might be honored. The pagans and Jews were displeased with what had happened "for because of it many had believed in the Messiah. Increasingly they saw the signs which had occurred by his name after his ascension were many times more than those which had occurred before his ascension." After Protonike's return to Rome "she related the things which had happened to Claudius Caesar. When Caesar heard it, he commanded all the Jews to leave the country of Italy. . . . She also told Simon Peter that which had happened."[8]

Contrary to the Helena and Kyriakos versions which were widely known in the main tongues of Antiquity—Greek, Latin and Aramaic—the Protonike legend is only known in Syriac (and later in Armenian). We may therefore safely assume that it was not known outside the Syriac-speaking regions.[9] The Protonike story circulated in two alternative forms in these Syriac-speaking regions: as part of the *Doctrina Addai*, the fictional legend about the foundation of the Edessene Church, and as an independent story.[10]

Since the last decades of the nineteenth century there has been a lively interest among theologians and historians in the story of the *inventio crucis*. Modern research started with the publication of various manuscripts of the legend.[11] However, the scholarly discussion found a temporary end with the publication of J. Straubinger's *Die Kreuzauffindungslegende. Untersuchungen über ihre altchristlichen Fassungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der syrischen Texte* (Paderborn 1912).[12] Recently the discussion of the legend of the *inventio crucis* has been taken up again,[13] mainly as a result of David Hunt's *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312-460* (Oxford, 1982). The second chapter of this book "Constantine and the Holy Land. Helena—History and Legend" was a stimulus for modern research. In this chapter Hunt

argues that there must have been a connection between Constantine the Great's building of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in the second half of the 320s, the visit of Helena to the Holy Land *c.* 327 as described by Eusebius in his *Vita Constantini* (3.42-47) and the presence of relics of the Cross in this church as attested by the *Cathechetical Lectures* of bishop Cyril of Jerusalem dating from the end of the 340s.[14] It has long been supposed that the legend was of Latin origin but recent research has made evident that the legend of the discovery of the Cross originated in Jerusalem in the middle or the second half of the fourth century.[15] It is also generally agreed upon that the Kyriakos and Protonike versions of the legend are based on the Helena version.[16]

Research on the legend of the *inventio crucis* has been mainly focused on the origin of the Helena legend and on the Kyriakos version. The Protonike version has not yet attracted much attention. With regard to the Protonike story I would like to raise three points in this paper. First, why the story about Protonike's discovery of the Cross became part of the *Doctrina Addai.* Secondly, when the story became part of the *Doctrina* and who may have been responsible for its insertion. Thirdly, did the Protonike legend exist as an independent narrative before its becoming part of the *Doctrina*, or did it come into being because of the wish to incorporate the traditions about the discovery of the Cross into the *Doctrina*?

The *Doctrina Addai* or Abgar legend originated in the North Mesopotamian city of Edessa. It is the official, but fictional, report of the foundation of the Edessene church and relates how Christianity came to Edessa in apostolic times when King Abgar, surnamed Ukkâmâ (4 B.C.E—7 C.E.;—13 C.E.—50 C.E.) reigned over the city. Abgar, who suffered from an unspecified disease, had heard about Jesus' healing miracles and invited him by letter to come to Edessa. Abgar assured him that in Edessa he could not only cure him but also that in his city he would be safe from the hostilities of the Jews. Jesus, however, declined Abgar's proposal, but promised to send him one of his disciples after his own ascension to heaven. After Jesus' death the apostle Addai was sent to Edessa by Jesus' alleged twin brother Judas Thomas. Addai cured Abgar and was consequently permitted to preach the Christian faith. Thanks to Addai, who was also made bishop of Edessa, Christianity spread rapidly among the Edessenes as well as among the inhabitants of the city's surrounding countryside. By the time of Addai's death the whole city had been converted.

The *Doctrina Addai* originated at the end of the third century, probably

in reaction to the spread of Manichaeism in North Mesopotamia. It must be considered as a piece of Christian propaganda which emphasizes the fact that Christianity in Edessa went back to the time of Christ himself.[17] Over the centuries the *Doctrina* gradually developed and new elements and traditions—e.g. a legend about the portrait of Christ, a correspondence between Tiberius and Abgar, the Protonike legend—were incorporated until it reached its final redaction somewhere in the fifth century.[18]

Already in the last century it was concluded that the Protonike legend was incorporated into the *Doctrina* at a later stage. There is a *communis opinio* that this must have happened at the beginning of the fifth century.[19] Even though the German scholar R.A. Lipsius, who at the end of the nineteenth century published a fundamental work on the *Doctrina Addai*, held the opinion that the Protonike legend "mit den Acten des Thaddaeus [= Addai] nur in einem sehr äusserlichen Zusammenhang steht,"[20] the *Doctrina* and the Protonike legend have much in common. One of the common characteristics is the anti-Judaism in both texts. King Abgar is described as a man who hated the Jews. In a letter he advised the emperor Tiberius to take action against the Jews in order to punish them for the crucifixion of Christ.[21] On his deathbed Addai warns his priests to beware of the Jews and not to befriend them because they have the blood of Christ on their hands.[22] In the Protonike legend the Jews are said to prosecute and imprison the Christians; furthermore, the Jews keep the Christians from visiting Golgotha and Christ's tomb, the Jews rejoice when Protonike's daughter falls dead upon entering the tomb, and the end of the story tells us how as a consequence of Protonike's experiences the Jews were expelled from Italy. I once thought that the anti-Jewish similarities between *Doctrina* and the Protonike legend were the only reason for including the legend in the foundation legend of the Edessene church.[23] However, there are more correspondences between the two texts.[24] The apostle Simon Peter is mentioned various times in the legend as well as in the *Doctrina*. His wonders and powers made Protonike convert to Christianity, as mentioned at the beginning of the legend. At the end of the legend when Protonike had returned to Rome, she went to Simon Peter to tell him everything that had happened in Jerusalem.[25] In his speech to the leading priests of the Edessene church shortly before his death, Addai mentions Simon Peter as the one who had sent the Letters of Paul from the city of Rome to Edessa: ". . . the Letters of Paul, which Simon Peter sent to us from the city of Rome. . . ." Near the end of the *Doctrina* Simon Peter is mentioned as bishop of Rome: ". . . Simon Peter . . . who had been Bishop there in Rome

twenty-five years in the days of Caesar who reigned there thirteen years."[26] The Protonike legend opens with a reference to Tiberius' war with the Spaniards: "Protonice, the wife of Claudius Caesar, whom Tiberius had made second in his kingdom when he went to war against the Spaniards who had rebelled against him. . . ."[27] This war is also referred to in the *Doctrina* where the correspondence between Abgar and Tiberius is discussed: "Because of the war with the Spaniards, who have rebelled against me. . . ."[28] A central theme of the *Doctrina Addai* are Christian acts of healing. Jesus himself was especially known to King Abgar as a good physician, whose ability is so great that he can even raise the dead to life again.[29] Because of his healing capacities Abgar wrote to Jesus requesting him to come to Edessa: "Abgar Ukkama to Jesus, the good Physician who has appeared in the land of Jerusalem; my Lord, peace. I have heard concerning you and your healing that you do not heal with drugs or roots; it is rather by your word that you give sight to the blind, cause the lame to walk, cleanse the lepers and cause the deaf to hear; by your word you heal spirits, lunatics, and those in pain. You even raise the dead."[30] The apostle Addai also has healing powers. He is able to cure Abgar from his disease and to restore to health many of his courtiers: "As soon as he [Addai] laid his hand upon him [Abgar] he was healed from the pain of his illness. . . . Moreover, in all the city he performed great healings. . . ."[31] It is in fact this curing power of Addai which persuaded many Edessenes to become Christians. Healing is also a central theme of the Protonike story. The climax of the story is the raising from the dead of Protonike's daughter by the touch of the Holy Wood, by which the True Cross could be recognized. Important as the recognition of the Cross of Christ was, it has deservedly been argued that the healing miracle performed by the Holy Wood was of even greater importance than the discovery of the Cross as such.[32] The Cross performs the same miracles as Jesus during his life on earth; one might even say that the Cross symbolises Christ himself.

The *Doctrina Addai* shows Edessa's desire to be considered one of the important Christian cities of the world. For this reason the *Doctrina* stresses that Edessa's Christianity goes back to the time of Jesus himself: Edessa's king and Jesus have corresponded[33] and one of his apostles converted the whole city shortly after Christ's crucifixion and ascension. Besides Edessa's longing for a special position in the Christian world, the *Doctrina* also demonstrates the city's wish to maintain good relations with Rome and the imperial house. With regard to this, the exchange of letters between Abgar and the emperor Tiberius is especially illustrative. The correspondence

about what to do with the Jews, the murderers of Christ, presents Abgar as a subordinate of Tiberius who offers his help to solve the "Jewish problem" and clearly demonstrates Edessa's intention to maintain a good relationship with Rome.[34] Besides Edessa and Rome, the only other city which figures in the *Doctrina Addai* is Jerusalem. It is Jerusalem where Abgar sends his letter to Jesus since he dwells and performs his healing miracles there. At the beginning of the *Doctrina* Jerusalem is presented as a Jewish city up to the moment of the discovery of the Cross. After the Cross is found Jews and pagans convert and a church is ordered to be built on Golgotha. In the fourth century the traditions about the discovery of the True Cross and the veneration of relics of the Cross in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on Golgotha, made Jerusalem one of the foremost cities in the Christian world. Since according to these traditions the Cross was said to be discovered by the empress Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, a direct relationship between Jerusalem, its bishop's see and the imperial house was established.[35] By incorporating the story about the discovery of the Cross into the *Doctrina Addai* Edessa associates itself with Jerusalem, an important if not the foremost Christian city of the East. But the insertion of the story also expresses a wish for a special bond between the Christian city of Edessa and the Christian imperial house.[36] Jerusalem, which because of the traditions about the *inventio crucis* had the emperor's special attention and patronage, must have served as example for Edessa. Especially since the fatal campaign against the Sasanians in 363, as a result of which Edessa had come to border on the Persian empire, good relations with the Roman imperial government were of great importance for the Edessenes.[37]

We have seen so far that there are several points in common between the Protonike story and the *Doctrina Addai* and that the Protonike legend is not the "Fremdkörper" in the *Doctrina* that it was long supposed to be. We may also conclude that the incorporation of the tradition about the *inventio crucis* into the *Doctrina* must have been a conscious choice to emphasize Edessa's special status as a Christian city beginning at the time of Christ himself and to establish a connection with Jerusalem and with the imperial house. Besides these points there are also similarities of a theological nature between the Protonike legend and the *Doctrina Addai.*

The *Doctrina Addai* proclaims that Christ is God who was created by God and who has become man, that the Son of God is God, that Christ by his very nature is God, and that Christ is God with his Father.[38] Expressions like these and others in the *Doctrina* must be seen against the

fierce christological discussions which took place in Late Antiquity, especially in the eastern parts of the Roman Empire and thus also in Edessa. In the first half of the fifth century the christological debates focused on the issue of monophysitism and diophysitism. Monophysite ideas figure strongly in the *Doctrina*. The opinions the *Doctrina* expresses on the one nature of Christ cannot be seen as separate from the christological discussions in the fifth century.[39] Since, as we have seen, there are many resemblances between the *Doctrina Addai* and the Protonike legend, it is not surprising that the Protonike legend also displays monophysite features in two passages—prayers of the empress—where it is said that Christ is God in human form, and that Christ has only a godly nature: "The God who gave himself to death for all people, being crucified in this place and laid in this tomb, and who as God gives life to all . . ."; ". . . if this cross is yours, my Lord, and on it your humanity was hung by shameless men, show the strong and mighty power of your divinity which dwells in the humanity. . . ."[40]

There is general agreement that the Protonike legend became part of the *Doctrina Addai* in the first decades of the fifth century (see n. 19). A more precise dating seems possible than this rather vague chronological indication. If we take into consideration what has thus far been said on the correspondences between the *Doctrina Addai* and the Protonike legend, there are various indications which date the incorporation of the traditions of the *inventio crucis* into the *Doctrina* in the years between 431 and 436 when the episcopate of Edessa was held by Rabbula. It is not even unlikely that Rabbula himself had a hand in the origin of the Protonike legend.

Rabbula became bishop of Edessa in 412 and occupied the Edessene see until his death in 436. After his death a *Vita Rabbulae* was composed in Syriac by an anonymous writer, which is the main document we possess for the history of Rabbula's life.[41] In this *vita* Rabbula is presented as a model bishop, who is praised for his pious and ascetic behaviour, as well as for the care of his flock and clergy. Rabbula came from a wealthy family near Qenneshrin (Chalcis). His mother was a Christian but his father was a pagan priest who is said to have performed offerings on behalf of Julian the Apostate when the latter passed by on his way to Persia to wage war against the Sasanians. Rabbula remained pagan in spite of the fact that his mother found him a Christian wife. Only after he had seen healing miracles performed by the hermit Abraham who lived near his estate at Qenneshrin did Rabbula become a Christian. He went to the holy sites

in Palestine and was baptized in the river Jordan. After this pilgrimage he sold his property and distributed the proceeds among the needy and poor. His mother and wife became nuns and he sent his children to a monastery. Rabbula himself lived an austere life of asceticism until he was elected bishop of Edessa. As bishop he cared for the orphans, widows, and spent large sums for the support of the poor.[42] Also as bishop Rabbula led an ascetic life; he ate only once a day, some bread and vegetables, and he spent the night praying. In other words, Rabbula is presented is an *alter Christus*. The *vita* lacks any information on the various actions of bishop Rabbula, on his role at the Council of Ephesus (431) and on the profound religious conflicts which took place during his episcopate between Christians on the one hand and Jews and heretics on the other hand, as well as among Edessene Christians themselves on christological issues. Nor does the *vita* tell us anything about the building activities in Edessa undertaken by Rabbula.[43] The subjects about which the *Vita Rabbulae* is silent are therefore just as interesting as, and perhaps even of more interest, than the subjects about which it provides information.

In the first decades of his episcopacy Rabbula seems with regard to christology to have been an adherent of the Antiochene theology, whose main representative was Theodore of Mopsuestia. This theology was of a diophysite nature. The theological writings of Theodore were read at the famous School of Edessa, or the School of the Persians as it was also called.[44] We may therefore suppose that Edessa's bishop, his clergy and the teachers at the School of Edessa were adherents of the diophysite Antiochene theology. At the Council of Ephesus in 431, where the diophysite doctrines of Nestorius (a pupil of Theodore) were discussed, Rabbula's position is not altogether evident, but he seems to have supported the Antiochene party against Cyril of Alexandria who in his Twelve Anathemas had condemned the diophysitism of Nestorius.[45] However, back in Edessa Rabbula radically changed his doctrinal point of view—the emperor Theodosius' abandonment of Nestorius shortly after the Council of Ephesus and the possibility of losing his episcopal see as a consequence of his christological views may have something to do with this—and became a fervent supporter of Cyril of Alexandria and like him a fierce opponent of diophysite ideas. A lively correspondence between the two bishops ensued in which Rabbula severely criticizes the ideas of Theodore of Mopsuestia, expresses his monophysite sympathies and shows himself an enthusiastic adherent of Cyril. Rabbula was such an admirer of the Alexandrian bishop that he even translated one of his treatises into Syriac.[46] When in 433 Cyril and

the Antiochene bishop John, who had abandoned the ideas of Nestorius, came to an agreement, the so-called *Formula of Union*, Rabbula, who had already preached against the theology of Theodore and the doctrinal ideas of Nestorius,[47] saw his chance and condemned the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Rabbula even had Theodore's writings burned.[48] Rabbula's actions brought him into open conflict with the School of Edessa and especially with Hiba, the head of the School. As a consequence of the polemics between the two men and their parties, Hiba was eventually sent into exile in 433.[49] The letter Hiba wrote to Mari shortly after he was exiled from Edessa is illuminating with respect to Rabbula's behaviour.[50] He calls Rabbula the Tyrant of Edessa who had declared the writings of Theodore anathema for personal reasons. Theodore had offended Rabbula at a synod and hence Rabbula bore a grudge against Theodore.[51] The conflict between Rabbula's party, the monophysites, and that of Hiba, the diophysites, may have been accompanied by public riots in the streets of Edessa, just as happened sixteen years later in 449.[52] What becomes clear from all this is that Rabbula apparently was not the *alter Christus* as presented in his *vita* and that since 431 the Edessene bishop had very strong monophysite sympathies for which he was even prepared to get into conflict with Hiba, who was not just anybody but the head of the prestigious School of Edessa.

The *Vita Rabbulae* informs us that Rabbula managed to convert thousands of heretics—among them Marcionites and Arians—and Jews to the right faith. Other heretics, like the Borborians, he expelled from his diocese because of the outrageousness of their ideas. Rabbula's efforts to win heretics for the orthodox faith did not go without violence and their places of worship were sometimes ravaged.[53] As to the conversion of the thousands of Jews, we may assume that their going over to Christianity was not an act of free will. From the *Chronicum Edessenum* we know that Rabbula converted the synagogue in Edessa into a church dedicated to the protomartyr St. Stephen.[54] The discovery of the relics of St. Stephen, who had been stoned to death by the Jews (Acts 7:58-59), was considered by the Christians evidence that the Jews were indeed guilty of his death, just as the finding of the Cross was proof that the Jews were responsible for the crucifixion of Christ.[55] The expropriation of the synagogue reflects the anti-Jewish climate in Edessa, which seems to have had a considerable Jewish community, and is an indication, if not evidence, of Rabbula's anti-Judaism.[56] For him there was only the orthodox faith, and everybody—diophysites, other heretics and Jews—had to adopt willingly or unwillingly the bishop's faith.

The *vita* reports that shortly after his conversion to Christianity, Rabbula

went to Jerusalem to visit the holy places.[57] Among the sites Rabbula visited were Golgotha and the Tomb of Christ,[58] and thus the Church of the Holy Sepulchre which was built over these sites. It may well be that in Jerusalem Rabbula, like many other pilgrims, first became acquainted with the legend of the *inventio crucis*. Relics of the Cross were kept in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The pilgrim Egeria reports that on Good Friday these relics were shown to the Christian community and the pilgrims present, to be venerated and kissed. She also mentions that on 14 September the discovery of the Cross was commemorated in Jerusalem.[59] Rabbula may have been present on one of these occasions or perhaps on both. Since the *vita* also reports that Rabbula was baptized in the Jordan and since baptisms mostly took place at Easter time, it seems not unlikely that Rabbula was in Jerusalem on Good Friday and participated in the ceremonies in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in which the Cross played a central role. Anyhow, Rabbula must have known the legend of the discovery of the Cross as would any pilgrim who had visited Jerusalem. Apparently Rabbula had great veneration for the Cross as a Christian symbol. He considered it a life-bringing symbol and as a sign of victory, as can be concluded from a Hymn on the Cross which Rabbula composed.[60] The inclusion in the Syriac lectionary of the commemoration of the apparition of the luminous cross in the sky above Jerusalem may also have been an initiative of Rabbula and is another indication of Rabbula's reverence for the symbol of the Cross.[61]

It appears from the above that Rabbula was not the model bishop as presented by the *Vita Rabbulae*, but a fanatical Christian who persecuted all those who had other ideas, such as diophysites and other heretics, as well as Jews. There is a remarkable resemblance between Rabbula's monophysitism and anti-Judaism and the monophysite and anti-Jewish character of the Protonike legend. This can hardly be a coincidence. Furthermore, Rabbula knew the legend of the *inventio crucis* and held the symbol of the Cross in great veneration. It is not at all unlikely that Rabbula saw the opportunity which the legend offered to emphasize and advance his own ideas in his christological conflict with Hiba and the latter's diophysite adherents. Rabbula must also have recognized the possibility of employing the legend in his competition with the Jews in Edessa. The story about the discovery of the Christian sign which brought victory over dissenters, such as heretics and Jews, would also bring Rabbula his victory over Jews and over those who had ideas which were dissentient from his own. Rabbula, who must have been a shrewd politician, may also have understood the

power of the legend in advancing the status of Edessa as a Christian city by associating itself with Jerusalem as well as in establishing a link with the imperial government. I would therefore suggest that it was during the episcopacy of Rabbula—probably in the 430s when the conflict between monophysites and diophysites broke out in Edessa—that the traditions about the discovery of the Cross which first originated in Jerusalem were transformed into the Protonike legend.

The above implies that the Protonike legend was created to incorporate the traditions about the *inventio crucis* into the *Doctrina Addai* and that it was not an independent story before its inclusion, as contended by some.[62] The adaptation of the original traditions about the discovery of the Cross to the first-century circumstances of the *Doctrina Addai*, which must have been quite a "tour de force," can only have been done with the express purpose of making these traditions fit into the context of the *Doctrina*. Therefore the Protonike legend began as part of the *Doctrina* and was only at a second stage separated from it to circulate independently.[63]

It is likely that the Protonike legend came into being on the initiative of bishop Rabbula and that it was his idea to make it part of the official foundation legend of the Edessene church, the *Doctrina Addai*. Insertion of the legend into the *Doctrina* was meant to establish connections between Edessa and Jerusalem and between Edessa and the imperial house. With respect to this the roles performed in the legend by the empress and the bishop of Jerusalem are to be noticed.[64] But Rabbula also employed the legend to propagate the right faith against the Jews and the diophysites in Edessa. The legend may especially be seen as a "weapon" in Rabbula's christological conflict with Hiba in the first half of the 430s to promote monophysitism. By adding the legend of the *inventio crucis* to the *Doctrina Addai*, the most important document of the Edessene church, Rabbula gave his own ideas on the faith the aura of authority.[65]

NOTES

[1] This is an elaborate version of a short paper presented at the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Oxford, 21-26 August 1995. See my "Protonike legend and the *Doctrina Addai*," in: Elizabeth A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica* vol. XXXIII (Louvain, 1997) 517-523.

[2] F. Winkelmann, *Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia* (Sitzungsberichte der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 65, Nr. 3, Berlin, 1966); F. Winkelmann, "Charakter und Bedeutung der Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 1 (1966) 346-385.

[3] Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.* 10,7-8.

[4] S. Heid, "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalems," *JbAC* 32 (1989) 41-71, 63; Jan Willem Drijvers, *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and her Finding of the True Cross* (Leiden 1992) 100-101.

[5] Ambrose, *de ob. Theod.* 40-49; Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* 31,4-5; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2,33-34; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1,17; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 2,1-2; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 1,18. Although these texts all go back to the version of Gelasius of Caesarea, Ambrose's text differs from the others since his main theme is not so much the discovery of the Cross as the matter of the *hereditas fidei*, a not unimportant issue on the death of the very Christian Theodosius the Great; see W. Steidle, "Die Leichenrede des Ambrosius für Kaiser Theodosius und die Helena-Legende," *Vig. Christ.* 32 (1978) 94-112; F.A. Consolino, "Il significato dell' Inventio Crucis nel De Obitu Theodosii," *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia* 5 (Firenze, 1984) 161-180. For a comparison of the texts of these authors, see Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 100-117, and S. Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was Found. From Event to Medieval Legend* (Stockholm, 1991) Ch. 3.

[6] The best known version is probably the one in the *Legenda Aurea* (*Jacobus de Voragine, Legenda Aurea, De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, Th. Graesse ed., 1890, 303-311). The original traditions about the discovery of the Cross did not contain anti-Jewish elements, but the legend's potential anti-Judaism was soon noticed and developed. For the Kyriakos version see e.g. Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was found*, 145 ff.; S. Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," *Analecta Bollandiana* 109 (1991) 73-108; Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 165 ff.; Han J.W. Drijvers & Jan Willem Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross. The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac. Introduction, Text and Translation*, CSCO 565, Subs. 93 (Louvain, 1997).

[7] See Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 159-160 for other differences as a consequence of adjusting the legend to first-century circumstances.

[8] *DA* f.7b-f.11a. See for an English translation: G. Howard, *The Teaching of Addai* (Texts and Translations 16, Early Christian Literature Series 4, Chico, 1981) 21-33. The passages between quotation marks are derived from this edition.

[9] Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 79 is wrong in supposing that the Church Historian Socrates knew the legend. "Sokrates . . . kennt offensichtlich die Protonikelegende."

[10] Nine mss. in Syriac are known which contain the (independent) Protonike story. For a list of these mss., see A. Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus. Présentation et traduction du texte syriaque intégral de La Doctrine d'Addaï* (Turnhout, 1993) 47-48, and A. Desreumaux, "Les titres des oeuvres apocryphes chrétiennes et leurs corpus. Le cas de la <Doctrine d'Addai> Syriaque," in: M. Tardieu (ed.), *La formation des canons scripturaires* (Paris, 1993) 203-217, 212-214. The independent Protonike story includes in most mss. an additional paragraph where it is told that the cross found by Protonike was hidden again by the Jews in the time of the emperor Trajan. This addition is clearly meant to connect the Protonike story with the Judas Kyriakos version of the *inventio crucis*; see e.g. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 165 ff. The Kyriakos version, the original language of which was Greek, was also known in Syriac. The Syriac texts of this version tell how the Cross was found for the second time—in the Syriac tradition the first discovery was made by Protonike—by the empress Helena with the help of the Jew Judas. After the discovery Judas converted and adopted the name Kyriakos; see Drijvers & Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross*.

[11] A. Holder, *Inventio Sanctae Crucis* (Leipzig, 1889) published a Latin manuscript (Paris BN 2769); E. Nestle, "Die Kreuzauffindungslegende. Nach einer Handschrift vom Sinai," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 4 (1895) 319-345, published a Greek manuscript (Sinai 493); E. Nestle, *De Sancta Cruce* (Berlin, 1889) has two Syriac manuscripts (Londin. BL Add. 12.174; Londin. BL Add. 14.644).

[12] Straubinger was the first to classify the various traditions of *inventio crucis* as Helena- Kyriakos- and Protonike legend.

[13] Heid, "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalems"; Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende"; Borgehammer, *How the Holy Cross was found*; Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*.

[14] *Catechesis* IV 10 = PG 33, 470 ("... and already the whole world is filled with fragments of the wood of the Cross."); *Catechesis* X 19 = PG 33, 685-687 ("The holy wood of the Cross gives witness: it is here to be seen in this very day, and through those who take [pieces] from it in faith, it has from here already filled almost the whole world."); *Catechesis* XIII 4 = PG 33, 777 ("... the wood of the Cross which from this place is spread piecemeal all over the world.").

[15] Heid, "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende"; Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was found*, 9 ff.; Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 95 ff. The view that the legend is of Latin origin is still contended in some recent publications; e.g. H. Busse & G. Kretschmar, *Jerusalemer Heiligtumstraditionen in altkirchlicher und frühislamischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden, 1987); A. Demandt, *Die Spätantike. Römische Geschichte von Diocletian bis Justinian 284-565 n.Chr.* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft III.6, München, 1989) 76 n. 75.

[16] For a divergent view, see M. van Esbroeck, "L'opuscule *Sur la Croix* d'Alexandre Chypre et sa version Géorgienne," *Bedi Kartlisa* 37 (1979) 102-132, 111-121; M. van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix," *Analecta Bollandiana* 102 (1984) 99-134, 126 ff.; M. van Esbroeck, M., "La portée politico-religieuse des visions pour la conversion des peuples," *Revue de l'institut catholique de Paris* 53 (1995) 87-104, 99 ff.; A. Desreumaux, "La doctrine d'Addai. Essai de classement des témoins syriaques et grecs," *Augustinianum* 23 (1983) 181-186, 184 ff. Van Esbroeck, followed by Desreumaux, argues that the three versions of the legend of the discovery of the Cross all came into existence when the patriarch John II of Jerusalem (387-417) instituted the function of *staurophylax* in Jerusalem. In Van Esbroeck's opinion the three versions of the legend belong together and it is impossible to indicate a chronological priority. This theory has convincingly been refuted by Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 74-76; see also Drijvers & Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross*, 19-20.

[17] For the origin and development of the *Doctrina Addai*, see H.J.W. Drijvers, "Abgarsage," in: W. Schneemelcher (Hrsg.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, Band 1, Evangelien (Tübingen, 1990) 389-395; Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*, "Introduction." For the origin of the *Doctrina* as reaction to Manichaeism, see H.J.W. Drijvers, "Addai und Mani," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 221 (1983) 171-185.

[18] The ms. Petersburg/Leningrad N.S. 4 of the *Doctrina Addai*, which is to be dated to the end of the fifth century, is generally assumed to be the final redaction of the *Doctrina Addai*. The ms. was first published and translated by G. Phillips, *The Doctrine of Addai, the Apostle. Now First Edited in a Complete Form in the Original Syriac* (London, 1876). For a new English translation see Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*. A French translation is offered by Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*. The ms. is described by

M. van Esbroeck, "Le manuscrit syriaque nouvelle série 4 de Leningrad (V^e siècle)," *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont. Contributions à l'étude des christianismes orientaux*, Cahiers d'Orientalisme XX (Geneva, 1988) 211-219. A photographical reproduction of the ms. as well as a Russian translation is given in Elena M. Meshtcherskaya, *Legenda ob Avgare. Rannesirijskij literaturnyj pamjatnik* (Moscow, 1984).

[19] L.J. Tixeront, *Les origines de l'église d'Édesse et la légende d'Abgar* (Paris, 1888) 178; Straubinger, *Die Kreuzauffindungslegende*, 94; Van Esbroeck, "L'opuscule," 116; Desreumaux, "La Doctrine d'Addai," 184.

[20] R.A. Lipsius, *Die Edessenische Abgarsage* (Braunschweig, 1880) 69.

[21] *DA* f.51 = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 13; *DA* f.23b-f.25a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 75-81.

[22] *DA* f.27a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 87. See also *DA* f.2a, f.3a, f.26b, f.30a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 5, 9, 85 and 97 for more anti-Jewish remarks.

[23] Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 161-162. In the Dutch edition (*Helena Augusta. Waarheid en Legende*, Groningen 1989, Ph.D. thesis) I propounded the view that the reason for inserting the Protonikelegend into the *Doctrina Addai* might have some connection with the *Doctrina* as an originally anti-Manichaean or anti-gnostic text. This view cannot be held, as Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 77-80 has also made clear.

[24] See also Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 88-89.

[25] *DA* f.7b, f.10b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 21, 33.

[26] *DA* f.29a, f.33a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 93, 105.

[27] *DA* f.7b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 21.

[28] *DA* f.24b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 77-79. See also Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 88-89.

[29] J.B. Segal, *Edessa. "The Blessed City"* (Oxford, 1970) 71; Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 85; A. Desreumaux, "La *Doctrina Addai*: le chroniqueur et ses documents" in: *Apocrypha. Le champ des apocryphes* 1 (1990), *la fable apocryphe* I, 249-267, 258.

[30] *DA* f.3a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 7.

[31] *DA* f.5b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 15.

[32] Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 86.

[33] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1,13 mentions the correspondence between Jesus and Abgar. The pilgim Egeria when visiting Edessa *c.* 384 was told about the correspondence; the original letters were read to her and she took copies of them home; *It. Eger.* 19,8-19.

[34] The name of Abgar's mother, Augustina, may also express the Edessene wish for good relations with the imperial house. Augustina is a name that does not occur in Syriac but immediately brings to mind the imperial title of *Augusta*.

[35] Cyril of Jerusalem's letter to Constantius II on the apparition of a luminous cross in the sky above Jerusalem on 7 May 351 clearly shows Jerusalem's (wish for a) good relationship with the imperial house. See for an edition of this letter: E. Bihain, "L'épitre de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la Vision de la Croix (BHG3 413)," *Byzantion* 43 (1973) 264-296. For a Syriac edition of this letter, see J.F. Coakley, "A Syriac version of the Letter of Cyril of Jerusalem on the Vision of the Cross," *Analecta Bollandiana* 102 (1984) 71-84.

[36] See Desreumaux, "La Doctrine d'Addaï," 184-185; Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 93.

[37] This aspect is especially emphasized by Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 90 ff. According to Heid the Syrian Christians included the legend in the *Doctrina* to connect the Syrian church with the established church of the Roman Empire in the hope of being protected by the Roman emperor in case of hostilities by the Zoroastrian Persians. Interesting in this respect is also Ephraem Syrus' sometimes exalted view of the (Christian) Roman emperors, even of Jovian who, after the fatal Persian campaign of Julian the Apostate, had to give up Nisibis. As a consequence of this Ephraem had to leave Nisibis and settled in Edessa; see Sidney H. Griffith, "Ephraem, the Deacon of Edessa, and the Church of the Empire," in: Thomas H. Alton and Joseph P. Williman (eds.), *Diakonia. Studies in Honor of Robert T. Meyer* (Washington, 1986) 22-52, 31-35.

[38] *DA* f.5a-5b. f.11b, f.12b, f.17b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 13-15, 35, 39, 55.

[39] See A. Desreumaux, "La doctrine d'Addaï, l'image du Christ et les monophysites," in: F. Boespflug, N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II, 787-1987. Douze siècles d'images religieuses* (Paris, s.a.) 73-79, 75 ff.; Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*, 30-31, 35-36. Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 78 also draws attention to the orthodox character of the *Doctrina*.

[40] *DA* f.8a, f.9a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 25, 29.

[41] The *Vita* was published by J.J. Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Episcopi Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta* (Oxford, 1865); German translation in G. Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften der syrischen Kirchenväter Aphraates, Rabulas und Isaak von Ninive* (Kempten, 1874). See for Rabbula also P. Peeters, "La vie de Rabboula, évêque d'Édesse (mort 7 août 436)," *Mélanges de Grandmaison = Recherches de science religieuse* 18 (1928) 170-204 = P. Peeters *Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientales* I (Subs. Hagiogr. 27, Brussels, 1951) 139-170; G.G. Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa. Der Christ, der Bischof, der Theologe* (CSCO, Subs. 31, Louvain, 1969).

[42] See Han J.W. Drijvers, "The Man of God of Edessa, Bishop Rabbula, and the Urban Poor. Church and Society in the Fifth Century," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1996) 235-248.

[43] The Syriac *Legend of the Man of God* alludes to Rabbula's building activities when it says that Rabbula "interrupted work on many buildings and ceased the occupy his time with perishable things"; see Drijvers, "The Man of God of Edessa," 241-242, who argues probably correctly that Rabbula was an active builder.

[44] See E.R. Hayes, *L'école d'Édesse* (Paris, 1930). Han J.W. Drijvers, "The School of Edessa: Greek Learning and Local Culture," in: Jan Willem Drijvers & Alasdair A. MacDonald, *Centres of Learning. Learning and Location in Pre-modern Europe and the Near East* (Leiden, 1995) 49-59.

[45] I follow here the view of Peeters, "La vie de Rabboula," 156-157. Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*, 160 ff., although admitting that Rabbula's role at the council is not clear, thinks that the Edessene bishop had always been opposed to the Nestorian doctrines. There is, however, no indication that in the years before 431 Rabbula was an opponent of the Antiochene theology or spoke out against the ideas of Nestorius.

[46] Probably the treatise addressed to Theodosius II entitled *De recta in dominum nostrum Jesum Christum fide ad imperatorem Theodosium*. On the correspondence between Rabbula and Cyril, see Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*, 174-179.

[47] *Vita Rabbulae* = Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 199-203.

[48] See Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*, 165 ff.

[49] On the conflict between Rabbula and Hiba, see R. Duval, *Histoire d'Edesse, politique, religieuse et littéraire* (Amsterdam 1975²) 172-175; Hayes, *L'école d'Édesse*, 191-203.

[50] The letter which was originally written in Syriac survives in a Greek and Latin translation; A. Schwarz, *ACO* II.1.3, 32-34 and II.3.3, 39-43. The extant Syriac version is based on the Greek translation; J. Flemming, *Akten der Ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Neue Folge 15.1, Berlin, 1917) 48-52.

[51] Mar Barhadbsabba 'Arbaya, *Cause de la fondation des écoles*, PO IV.4.18, 1907, 380-381, tells that Rabbula was accused of physical violence towards his clerics. When he said in his defence that Jesus had done the same in the Temple at Jerusalem, Theodore had corrected him by saying that Jesus had not beaten up anybody but had only expelled all that sold and bought.

[52] After Rabbula's death in 436 the conflict between the monophysites and the party of Hiba, who had become Rabbula's successor, continued and came to a climax in 449. At the Robber Synod of Ephesus which took place in this year the monophysites succeeded in getting Hiba condemned, after much violence and riots in Edessa. Order had to be restored by the imperial *comes* Flavius Chaireas. See Flemming, *Akten der Ephesinischen Synode*, 14-55.

[53] Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Episcopi Edesseni . . . opera selecta*, 193, *ll.* 14-194, *l.* 18; Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 196-198. Rabbula's aggressiveness towards other believers showed itself already before he became bishop of Edessa. The *Vita Rabbulae* mentions that Rabbula once went to Heliopolis (Baalbek) with the intention of destroying a pagan temple.

[54] *Chronicum Edessenum*, ed. I. Guidi, *Chronica Minora* I (CSCO, Script. Syr. 1, Louvain, 1903) 6, sub LI.

[55] For the discovery of Stephen's relics, see E.D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312-460* (Oxford, 1982) 212 ff.

[56] For Jews in Edessa, see Segal, *Edessa*, 100-104; H.J.W. Drijvers, "Jews and Christians at Edessa," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 36 (1985) 88-102; H.J.W. Drijvers, "Syrian Christianity and Judaism," in: Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London/New York, 1992) 124-146. It is interesting that according to the *Vita Rabbulae* the Jews of Edessa lamented for Rabbula's death. There is a resemblance here with the *Doctrina Addai* where is said that the Edessene Jews mourned the death of Addai. In both cases the mentioning of the grief of the Jews must be considered Christian propaganda.

[57] Although the *vita* is not an historically trustworthy document, there is no doubt that Rabbula visited the Holy Land; see Peeters, "La vie de Rabboula," 143; Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*, 22.

[58] Overbeck, 165, *ll.* 1-3 = Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 171.

[59] *It. Eger.* 37,1-3 and 48,1.

[60] Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 271: "Der Kaiser Konstantin bekämpfte den Irrthum mit dem Zeichen des Lebens, welches er in der Himmelshöhe gesehen hatte, und besiegte und beschämte so die Abgötterei. Durch dasselbe Zeichen siegt auch die Kirche mit ihren Kindern über die ganze linke Seite. Das Kreuz erschien oben im Himmel; das Kreuz ist erhöht worden auf Golgatha; das Kreuz möge auch den auf es vertrauenden Christen als Schussmauer dienen!"

[61] F.C. Burkitt, "The early Syriac lectionary system," *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1921-1923) 301-338, 323-324. Considering Rabbula's veneration for the Cross, it seems not impossible that during his episcopate the letter of Cyril of Jerusalem to Constantius II, about the apparition of the celestial Cross in Jerusalem on 7 May 351, was translated into Syriac. Syriac edition of this letter: Coakley, "A Syriac version of the Letter of Cyril of Jerusalem."

[62] E.g. Lipsius, *Die Edessenische Abgarsage*, 69; Desreumaux, "La Doctrine d'Addaï," 184-185; Desreumaux, *Histoire de roi Abgar et de Jésus*, 22-23.

[63] See Nestle, *De Sancta Cruce*, 68-73 and Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was found*, 74-75. In composing the Protonike legend use was made of already existing Syriac documents. The occurrence of Simon Peter in the legend is based on a (monophysite) work entitled *Doctrine of Simon Képha in the city of Rome*; see W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (Amsterdam, 1967²) 35-41. The hiding of the Cross by the Jews is probably derived from the *Transitus Mariae* text; Cureton, *Ibid.*, 110-111. See also Desreumaux, "La *Doctrina Addaï*: le chroniqueur et ses documents," 263-264.

[64] The correspondence between Abgar and Tiberius, which also at a later stage was added to the *Doctrina Addai*, may also have had the purpose of bringing Edessa and the imperial house closer together.

[65] It may even be that the *Doctrina Addai* got its monophysite nature on the initiative of Rabbula. It may be worthwhile to compare the (christological) ideas expressed in the *Doctrina* with those in Rabbula's *De recta in dominum nostrum Jesum Christum fide ad imperatorem Theodosium.*

Oude Kijk in 't Jatstraat 26
Postbus 716, 9700 AS *Groningen*

'ΑΔΕΛΦΟΤΗΣ—TWO FREQUENTLY OVERLOOKED MEANINGS

BY

DANIEL F. STRAMARA, JR.

In his *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Lampe notes that ἀδελφότης may refer to "religious communities," even "communities of men and women living together." For the latter he provides only one witness—Gregory of Nyssa's *De virginitate* 23, which taken by itself may simply refer to "Christian community." This text shall be reviewed below. However, more declarative testimonies may be marshalled to substantiate the denotation "a single monastic community of men and women."

Perhaps the earliest comes from another Cappadocian, Gregory of Nazianzus. Some time after 360 this Gregory wrote "to the ἀδελφότητι of the blessed Leucadios at Sannabodae, to the monks and virgins who have been sanctified in Christ Jesus."[1] Gregory was desirous that each monk and nun (ἕκαστον καὶ ἑκάστην) model himself and herself on the life of their recently deceased superior, Leucadios.[2] This community, situated in Cappadocia, was most probably a double monastery of men and women, a type of ascetical institute later endorsed and promulgated by Basil of Caesarea.[3]

Significantly, Basil called his own monastic communities by the term *adelphotes*. That this designation referred to a single community of men and women can be verified at several places within his monastic rules. The first draft of these rules was composed between 365 and 369, only to be expanded and revised during the next seven years, *terminus ad quem* 376.[4] Regarding the admittance of children into the monastery, in Long Rule 15 Basil stipulated, "They should be reared with all piety as children belonging to the entire community (ἀδελφότητος), but meals and quarters for both girls and boys should be separate."[5] Upon attaining maturity, these young men and women were permitted to make monastic profession to one and the same *adelphotes*. Long Rule 33 deals with the communication between monks and nuns in the *adelphotes*. Short Rule 104 discusses the decision-making process in the *adelphotes* and refers to voting by the brothers and sisters. Other passages could be mustered.[6] Consequently, when a translator of Basil's Rules for double monasteries consistently ren-

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

ders ἀδελφότης as "brotherhood," this is misleading; sisters are included.[7] "Community" is a better translation in this instance.

Not surprisingly, the double monastery founded by Basil's sister is referred to as an *adelphotes* by their brother Gregory of Nyssa. He recounted,

> As I was arriving at the place itself (and the news of my presence had already been announced to the community [ἀδελφότητι]), an [lit. the] entire contingent of men poured forth from the monastic enclosure [τό τε σύνταγμα τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἅπαν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρῶνος]—for it was customary for them to honour guests by coming out to greet them—and a [lit. the] group of maidens from the convent [ὁ δὲ ἐν γυναιξὶ τῆς παρθενίας χορὸς] awaited our coming by the church in good order.[8]

The bishop of Nyssa designated the two groupings—ἀνδρών, the company of men (literally men's quarters) and παρθενών, the company of women (literally virgins' quarters)—by one term: ἀδελφότης.[9] The two groups together comprised one monastic community of male and female ascetics. This work was written sometime between the end of 380 and 383.[10]

However, as early as 371 Gregory of Nyssa wrote his *De virginitate* for Basil's monastics.[11] Gregory warned Basil's monks and nuns against those,

> who practice celibacy in name, but who do not refrain from social life, not only enjoying the pleasures of the stomach, but living openly with women, calling such a living together "brotherhood (ἀδελφότης)," and thinking that they are avoiding suspicion by this pious term. Because of them, this revered and pure way of life is blasphemed by the pagans.[12]

Clearly, ἀδελφότης was a "pious term" commonly employed to denote an ascetical community of both men and women. This is the text cited by Lampe. Understood in its broader context this passage makes sense. However, Gregory was referring to a group of people known as *agapetes*—vowed male and female celibates *living in the world* and dwelling together in one house. This practice was forbidden by the bishops.[13] The problem was, these *agapetes* were masquarading as true ascetics forming an *adelphotes*, when in reality they were creating a mixed monastery, not a canonically approved double monastery in which the sexes were strictly segregated and regulated.[14]

Such a practice of double monasticism was common in the early church, especially in Asia Minor.[15] Palladius' *Lausiac History*, written around 420, provides another such example.[16] Sisinnius, a Cappadocian by birth, travelled to Palestine and dwelt there for a decade practicing asceticism before returning in the late 380s or early 390s to his native country where he established and governed "an *adelphotes* of men and women," after having been ordained a priest.[17]

Another possible use of *adelphotes* to denote a community of monks and nuns is found in the *Historia Monachorum* in *Aegypto*. In the prologue, section 2, the author notes that "the pious *adelphotes* that lives on the holy Mount of Olives" had requested this account of his journeys. While the term might simply designate the brotherhood of monks to which he belonged, the men's cells were part of a double monastery established by Rufinus and Melania the Elder;[18] thus it could refer to the broader monastic community of men and women.

Demonstrably, given the witnesses of the three Cappadocian Fathers, Palladius and the anonymous monk from the Mount of Olives, the denotation of *adelphotes* as a religious community comprised of men and women was common throughout monastic history.

Yet not only can ἀδελφότης denote a monastic community of monks and nuns joined together, it can also designate a sisterhood, a convent of ascetical women. This meaning is not specified by Lampe. Palladius spoke of a μοναστήριον γυναικῶν in chapter thirty-three section one of his *Historia Lausiaca*. In section three he referred to it as an *adelphotes*. The context makes it clear that this was not a double monastery, but a sisterhood. Also, in chapter seventy, section three he mentioned a monastery of women, noting that a deaconess presided over this *adelphotes*. Once again monks are not involved in the situation.

Similarly, in a work ascribed to Basil of Caesarea, one finds the term *adelphotes* used to denote a sisterhood.[19] The term figures in a passage where the author specifically addresses issues concerning female monastics belonging to an *adelphotes* separate from that of the men; he instructs them to obey the directives of their superioress.

While in the fourth and fifth centuries ἀδελφότης can denote a brotherhood of monks, it can just as easily denote a double community of monks and nuns joined together, or even a sisterhood of nuns. Consequently, translating ἀδελφότης as "brotherhood" or "fraternity" could be misleading; "community" is a better rendering unless the context determines otherwise, making it gender specific. One must also keep in mind that the masculine plural ἀδελφοί can denote brothers and sisters together.[20] Furthermore, the mention of either monks or nuns does not automatically preclude a reference to a double monastery composed of both monks and nuns, a type of ascetical institute prevalent in the early church through the late Byzantine period.

NOTES

[1] See Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistula* 238 prologue, edited by Paul Gallay, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres* vol. 2 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967), 128.

[2] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistula* 238.4, Gallay 2:129; my translation.

[3] See William Kempe Lowther Clarke, *St. Basil the Great: A Study in Monasticism* (Cambridge: University Press, 1913), 104-5 and his *The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil* (London: SPCK, 1925), 37-39. I plan to write an article treating double monasticism in the Greek East.

[4] See Paul Jonathan Fedwick, *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979), 12 note 62.

[5] Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae fusius tractatae* 15, PG 31:952C; translated by Monica Wagner, *Saint Basil: Ascetical Works Fathers of the Church* vol. 9 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1950), 265.

[6] I will analyze the Rule of Basil in my article, "Double Monasticism in the Greek East."

[7] See Clarke, *The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil, passim.*

[8] Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita s. Macrina* 16, edited by Pierre Maraval, *Grégoire de Nysse: Vie de sainte Macrine, Sources chrétiennes* vol. 178 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1971), 194; translated by Kevin Corrigan, *The Life of Saint Macrina* (Toronto: Peregrina Publishing Co., 1989), 40-41.

[9] See the comments by Maraval in SC 178:194 notes 1 and 2.

[10] See SC 178:67.

[11] See Michel Aubineau, *Grégoire de Nysse: Traité de la virginité, Sources chrétiennes* vol. 119 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1966), 31 and Virginia Woods Callahan, "Introduction to On Virginity," *Fathers of the Church* vol. 58 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1967), 3.

[12] Gregory of Nyssa, *De virginitate* 23.4, SC 119:538/40; FC 58:71.

[13] The Synod of Ancyra in 314 ruled against this practice in canon 19 as did the Council of Nicaea I (325) in canon 3. See H. Hemmer, "Agapètes," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*; E. Magnin, "Agapètes," *Dictionnaire de droit canoni* → Antoine Guillaumont, "Le nom des 'Agapètes,'" *Vigiliae Christianae* 23 (1969): 30-37; and Gillian Cloke, "*This Female Man of God*": *Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age, A.D. 350-450* (London: Routledge, 1995), 77-81.

[14] For the canonists who make this distinction see H.J. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, (New York: B. Herder Books, 1937), 154 and E. Jombart, "Les monastères doubles," section 3 in "Cohabitation, historique," *Dictionnaire de droit canonique*, 3:972-73 read in connection with "Monastère," 5:929. For the historians who emphasize the difference see Jules Pargoire, "Les monastères doubles chez les byzantins," *Echos d'Orient* 9 (1906): 21 and V. Laurent, "Une princesse byzantine au cloître," *Echos d'Orient* 29 (1930): 48 note 5.

[15] For this assertion see Aimé Solignac, "Monachisme," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 10:1604; E.V. Severus and S. Hilpisch, "Monasterio doppio," *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione*; G. Cyprian Alston, "Monasteries, Double," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 452; Stephanus Hilpisch, *Die Doppelklöster: Entstehung und Organisation*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens* vol. 15 (Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen, 1928), 12; Jean Gribomont, "Le Panégyrique de la virginité, œuvre de jeunesse de Grégoire de Nysse,"

Revue d'ascétique et de mystique 43 (1967): 251 as well as his "Le monachisme au IV^{e} siècle en Asie Mineure: De Gangres au Messalianisme," *Studia Patristica* 2 (1957): 412.

[16] See Robert M. Meyer, *Palladius: The Lausiac History Ancient Christian Writers* vol. 34 (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1965), 7.

[17] Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 49, Cuthbert Butler, *Lausiac History of Palladius* (Cambridge: University Press, 1904), 2:143-44. For the dating see Susanna Elm, *"Virgins of God": The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 186.

[18] See Francis X. Murphy, "Melania the Elder," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*; Anne Ewing Hickey, *Women of the Roman Aristocracy as Christian Monastics* (Ann Arbor, MI: UNI Research Press, 1987), 46 and Norman Russell, *The Lives of the Desert Fathers: The Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1981), 123 note 6.

[19] See Basil of Caesarea, *Sermo asceticus II* 2, PG 31:888C. For its authenticity see Paul Jonathan Fedwick, "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea," in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic* edited by Paul Jonathan Fedwick (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981), 19.

[20] See "ἀδελφός," in Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

3745 Lindell Blvd., Apt. 304W
St. Louis, MO 63108

REVIEWS

Th. Böhm. *Theoria—Unendlichkeit—Aufstieg.* Philosophische Implikationen zu *De Vita Moysis* von Gregor von Nyssa. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 35. Leiden, Brill, 1996.

R.J. Kees. *Die Lehre von der* Oikonomia *Gottes in der* Oratio Catechetica *Gregors von Nyssa.* Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 30. Leiden, Brill, 1995.

Der Kapadozier Gregor von Nyssa war nicht nur Theologe, sondern auch Philosoph. Die beiden vorliegenden Studien beleuchten beide Aspekte seines Denkens. Zentrale philosophische Begriffe in seiner *Vita Moysis* (*VM*) werden untersucht von Böhm in der überarbeiteten Fassung seiner Dissertation, eingereicht an der Ludwig Maximilians Universität München.

Er benutzt die Methode der philosophischen Implikation, die in Teil I erklärt wird. Diese Methode will untersuchen, welchen philosophischen Hintergrund und welche Herkunft ein Begriff hat. Philosophische Begriffe, die Gregor verwendet, sind schon von anderen Denkern besprochen und diskutiert worden. Die Methode der philosophischen Implikation untersucht, auf welcher Diskussion Gregor aufruht und versucht, Konvergenzen und Divergenzen zu der philosophischen Tradition darzustellen.

In dem zweiten Teil behandelt Böhm das Proömium der *VM*. Er erklärt es mit Hilfe rhetorischer Tradition. In dem Proömium wird das philosophische Thema des Werkes eingeführt: das vollkommene Leben entsprechend der Tugend. Gregor bestimmt, dass die Vollkommenheit durch gewisse Grenzen festgelegt wird und erläutert dies mit dem Beispiel der Quantität: alles Quantitative wird durch Grenzen erfasst. Der Begriff der Quantität, differenziert in Kontinuierliches und Diskretes, wird entsprechend der Methode der philosophischen Implikation untersucht. Böhm studiert die Ansichten von Aristoteles, Plotin und Dexippus und konkludiert, dass Gregors Gedanken aus einer Diskussion von Dexippus mit Plotin über die aristotelische Bestimmung der Quantität verständlich werden. Die Vollkommenheit der Tugend aber kennt keine Grenzen, weil die Natur des Guten nur durch seinen Gegensatz begrenzt wird. Das höchste Gute ist die göttliche Natur, für die es keinen Gegensatz gibt, so dass sie grenzenlos ist.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

In dem dritten Teil findet man den Hauptteil der Untersuchung: die philosophischen Implikationen der *VM*. Ein zentraler Begriff in diesem Werk ist Theoria. Theoria ist der geistige Aufstieg der Seele, der bei dem sinnlich Erscheinenden ansetzt und zur Betrachtung Gottes hinführt. Dieser Aufstieg wird von der allegorischen Interpretation der Schrift unterstüzt. Der Aufstieg und das Streben der Seele nach Gott findet aber kein Ende, weil Gott unerkennbar, unsichtbar, unendlich und unbegrenzt ist. Böhm stellt Anknüpfungspunkte und Differenzen zur philosophischen Tradition dar. Seine Untersuchung beschränkt sich auf Platon, Aristoteles, Alkinoos, Plotin und Porphyrius. Er konkludiert, dass Gregor zwar aus der platonischen Tradition wesentliche Elemente für den Begriff der Theoria aufgreift, aber dass es eine grosse Differenz gibt hinsichtlich der Anschauung Gottes. Nach Gregor kann Gott in seiner Natur nicht betrachtet werden. Böhm geht auch auf die Mystik Gregors ein und folgert, dass es bei Gregor eine Mystik gibt, die mit keiner anderen vergleichbar ist. Auf Grund des Gottesbegriffs Gregors ist eine Betrachtung Gottes als Einung nicht möglich.

Mit dem Begriff der Theoria hängt eng zusammen die Unendlichkeit Gottes. Böhm argumentiert entgegen der These R.E. Heines, dass der Ansatz der Unendlichkeitsvorstellung in *VM* sich deckt mit dem in *Contra Eunomium*. Nach Böhm entwickelt Gregor die These der Unendlichkeit Gottes in *CE* in Polemik gegen Eunomius, um eine Stufung der Gottheit abzulehnen. Die eunomische Kontroverse spielt in *VM* keine Rolle mehr.

Auch die Unendlichkeitskonzeption wird im Sinne der philosophischen Implikation untersucht. Gregor unterscheidet sich klar von Platon; der Begriff der Unendlichkeit bei Aristoteles ist auch nicht zu verwenden um den Ansatz Gregors zu verdeutlichen. Seine Ansichten könnten von Plotin beeinflusst worden sein.

Böhm diskutiert zwei Konsequenzen der Unendlichkeitskonzeption, die einerseits die Sprache, andererseits die Anähnlichung an Gott betreffen. Gregor argumentiert gegen Eunomius, dass die Differenz setzende Sprache nicht imstande ist, das in sich Nicht-Differente, das ist die göttliche Natur, adäquat auszusagen. Mit den Begriffen Teilhabe und Anähnlichung bestimmt Gregor das Verhältnis des Menschen zu Gott, des Geschaffenen zu Ungeschaffenem. Die Unendlichkeit wird so überbrückt. Böhm weist hin auf Übereinstimmungen und Divergenzen mit Plotin. Gregor hat aber die Begriffe in einen christlichen Kontext eingebettet.

In Teil IV bespricht Böhm die drei Theophanien aus *VM*. Das Licht im brennenden Dornbusch (Ex. 3) ist Gott, das wahrhafte Sein, an dem alles teilhat. Gregor gibt eine christologische Interpretation: Gott ist die

Wahrheit, das Licht, das im Fleisch erschienen ist, d. i. Christus. Erfassung dieses wahrhaft Seienden ist Wahrheit. Trotz mancher Parallelen mit Plotin gibt es eine grosse Differenz. Für Gregor ist für die Erfassung der Wahrheit und für die Teilhabe das inkarnatorische Handeln Gottes nötig. Nach der ersten Theophanie schreitet die Seele weiter und geht in die Dunkelheit ein, wo Gott ist (Ex. 20:21). Die Dunkelheit bedeutet, dass Gott unmöglich zu erfassen ist. Die göttliche Natur ist unsichtbar und unerkennbar, und das Sehen wird zum Nicht-Sehen. Dieses Sehen ist aber—und dies ist eine wesentliche Differenz zu Plotin—ohne mystische Einigung. Der Sehende wird nicht eins mit dem Gesehenen. Die dritte Theophanie—Moses in der Felsspalte (Ex. 33)—auslegend, zeigt Gregor, dass das Streben der Seele nach Gott unendlich ist und dass die Seele in ihrem Aufstieg kein Ende findet. Gregor hängt hier der Idee des *progressus in infinitum* an, und reagiert damit auf Origenes, der behauptet, dass die Seele in der Betrachtung Gottes gesättigt wird.

In einem Ausblick (Teil V) gibt Böhm einige Anhaltspunkte für weitere Studien, u.a. theologiegeschichtliche Fragen und die Wirkungsgeschichte.

Böhms Studie ist eine eingehende Untersuchung von Begriffen, die in Gregors Denken einen zentralen Platz besitzen. Sie zeigt wie seine Ansichten von der philosophischen Tradition und Diskussion geprägt worden sind. Die Hervorhebung des philosophischen Hintergrunds lässt aber leicht vergessen, dass Gregor auch in einer christlichen Tradition steht, in der die Begriffe Theoria, Unendlichkeit und Aufstieg auch schon zu finden sind.

Die theologische Seite Gregors wird beleuchtet in der Studie von R.J. Kees, ebenfalls einer Dissertation, eingereicht an der Universität Göttingen 1993. Der Verfasser behandelt wichtige theologische Themen anhand der Lehre der *Oikonomia* in der *Oratio catechetica* (*or cat*). Gregor schrieb dieses Buch als Hilfe für die Unterweisenden in der christlichen Lehre, und entfaltete darin systematisch seine wichtigsten theologischen Gedanken. Seiner Zielsetzung gemäss verzichtet er auf ausführliche Entfaltung einzelner, sehr spezieller Themen, strebt aber wohl nach vollständiger Darstellung der Themen. Er sieht z.B. davon ab, die in der Auseinandersetzung mit Eunomius entwickelte Lehre der Unendlichkeit Gottes zu entfalten.

Bedeutend in diesem Werk ist der Unterschied zwischen der *Theologia*, der Gotteslehre und der *Oikonomia*, d. i. das Heilshandeln des Logos Gottes, das den Menschen betrifft. Das Heilshandeln wird sehr allgemein verstanden. Der Begriff *Oikonomia* umfasst die ganze Heilsgeschichte: die Erschaffung des Menschen und seine Ausstattung zur Teilhabe am Göttlichen, und die

Möglichkeit der Wiederherstellung des ursprünglichen Zustands im Christusgeschehen, d.h. die Inkarnation, der Tod und die Auferstehung Christi. Auch die Zueignung der durch Christus ermöglichten Wiederherstellung in den Sakramenten gehört zu ihr. In der *or cat* sind beide Themenkreise in ihrer Darstellung unterschieden, aber inhaltlich eng miteinander verknüpft. Die Gliederung des Werks entspricht dieser Unterscheidung. Die Kapitel 1 bis 4 behandeln die *Theologia*, und die Kapitel 5-40 die *Oikonomia*, untergliedert in drei Abschnitte: Gottes Heilshandeln 1. in der Schöpfung, 2. in Christus und 3. am glaubenden Menschen in den Sakramenten (II.2-3).[1]

Die enge Bezogenheit aufeinander zeigt sich darin, dass die *Oikonomia* verankert ist in der *Theologia*. Gregor zeigt, dass das Heilshandeln Gottes im Wesen Gottes liegt, und dass die *Oikonomia* zu den entscheidenden Äusserungen des Wesen Gottes gehört. Um die *Oikonomia* in eine trinitarische Gotteslehre zu verankern, führt er Sohn und Geist, die Subjekte der *Oikonomia*, als wirkende, lebendige Hypostasen der göttlichen Natur ein (IV.1). Er erreicht die Bezogenheit von *Theologia* und *Oikonomia* aufeinander durch eine Identifizierung von theologischen und oikonomischen Gotteseigenschaften. Der Kapadozier interpretiert die Güte, die klassische, theologische Eigenschaft Gottes, als Menschenliebe, und gerade die Liebe Gottes zu den Menschen ist für ihn der Grund für das Christusgeschehen. *Theologia* und *Oikonomia* stimmen also überein (IV.2).

Die Einheit von *Theologia* und *Oikonomia* zwingt Gregor zu Überlegungen über das Gute und Böse in der Welt. Er muss zeigen, dass das Böse nicht in Widerspruch ist mit der Güte Gottes. Nach Gregor ist das Böse ein Nichtsein. Es ist keine selbständige Grösse; es ist das Fehlen des Guten. Der Grund des Bösen liegt in der freien Selbstbestimmungsmacht des Menschen, und das Böse ist ein Tun des Menschen. Alles was nicht schlecht ist, ist gut. Mit dieser Auffassung kann er das Christusgeschehen verteidigen. Die natürlichen, menschlichen Lebensvorgänge sind auch gut, und sind nicht unziemlich für Gott. Deshalb kann Gott Mensch werden. Die Leiblichkeit, mit der der Mensch ausgestattet ist, muss positiv beurteilt werden, weil er das gute Geschöpf des guten Gottes ist (IV.3.1). In demselben Rahmen der Verteidigung der Güte Gottes, führt Gregor Gründe auf für den Fall des Menschen. Es sind die Wandelbarkeit, die freie Selbstbestimmungsmacht und die Leiblichkeit des Menschen. Sie liegen alle in der guten Ausstatung des Menschen und können nicht die gute Absicht des Schöpfers in Frage stellen (IV.3.2). Gregor hat also drei anthropologische Grundgegebenheiten gegeben als Voraussetzungen für den Fall, aber er muss auch erklären, warum es faktisch zum Fall kam. Er tut dies mit

Hilfe der Lehre vom Neid der Engelmacht. Die in das Böse verstrickte Engelmacht ist neidisch auf die gute Ausstattung des Menschen und täuschte ihn durch Trug (IV.3.3). Nach dem Fall bemüht Gott sich weiterhin um den Menschen. Der Grund dafür ist derselbe wie für die Schöpfung des Menschen: die Menschenliebe Gottes. Der Mensch wird gerettet durch den Logos Gottes. Die Auferstehung Christi, der "skopos" des Heilgeschehens, ermöglicht den Menschen die Rückkehr zu seiner ursprünglichen Bestimmung (IV.4). Die Auferstehung Christi hat nicht nur für die Menschen Bedeutung, sondern auch für die ganze Schöpfung. Die beiden Teile der Welt, das Sinnliche und das Geistige, sind voneinander getrennt durch den Fall des Menschen. Durch die Auferstehung, in der Christus die beiden Teile dauerhaft wieder verbindet, kann der Mensch wieder zwischen diesen beiden Teilen vermitteln, weil er zusammengesetzt ist aus Geistigem und Sinnlichem (IV.5). Das durch Christus Ermöglichte wird wirksam durch die Sakramente. Die Taufe ist Nachahmung des Todes und der Auferstehung Christi. Durch die Eucharistie hat der Mensch Anteil am vergöttlichten Leib Christi. Er eignet sich das zu, was in dem Christusgeschehen bewirkt ist. Die Heilsgeschichte erreicht ihr Ziel (IV.6).

Die *or cat* wurde 386 oder 387 geschrieben, nachdem Gregor sich in mehreren Werken beschäftigt hatte mit allen wichtigen Themen der Theologie, und in der eunomischen und apolinarischen Kontroverse seine Standpunkte entwickelt hatte. In der *or cat* gibt er eine Summa seiner Gedanken (V.1). Kees beschreibt die Entwicklung der Anthropologie und der Soteriologie Gregors bis zur *or cat*. Bezüglich der Anthropologie konstatiert er, dass in den späteren Werken (*or cat* und *Antirrheticus adversus Apolinarium*) Gregor die Leiblichkeit des Menschen positiver sieht als in den ersten Werken (*Der virginitate, De hominis opificio*). Sie wird nicht mehr angesehen als Folge der Sünde, sondern als ein Teil der guten Schöpfung Gottes. Hiermit hängt zusammen, dass in den späteren Werken der Teilhabegedanke—der Mensch hat Sein und Gutsein nur durch Anteilhabe am wahren Sein, am wahren Guten—einen zentraleren Platz einnimmt. Eine wichtige Grundstruktur des Menschen ist sein unendliches Streben zu Gott. Diese Lehre vom unendlichen Aufstieg der Seele, die in *De vita Moysis* und in *In canticum canticorum* einen erheblichen Platz einnimmt, ist in der *or cat* noch nicht anzutreffen; wohl aber finden wir in ihr Gründe für diese Lehre, nämlich dass der Mensch als Geschöpf ein Werdender ist und stetiger Veränderung unterliegt. Diese Veränderung ist nur als ein Streben zu dem unendlichen Gott zu realisieren. In den späteren Werken Gregors findet man diese Lehre der Unendlichkeit selbst (V.2). In bezug auf den

Entwicklungsgang der Soteriologie konstatiert der Verfasser, dass die Auferstehung Christi immer wichtiger wird. Sie hat in den früheren Werken keine besondere Funktion für die allgemeine Totenauferstehung, während später das Heilswerk Christi grössere Bedeutung für die Rettung des Menschen gewinnt: Christus überwindet den der Sünde folgenden Tod (V.3).

Der letzte Teil bietet einen Vergleich der in der *or cat* entfalteten Lehre mit der Lehre von Methodius und Athanasius. Der Verfasser folgert, dass Gregor in der *or cat* wichtige Grundkategorien des theologischen Denkens von Athanasius übernommen hat, während er von Methodius nur einige Gedanken eingefügt hat.

Ich habe eine kleine Anmerkung bei der Darstellung der Exegese von Gen. 3,21. Kees bemerkt, dass, nach Methodius, Origenes die Kleider aus toten Häuten deutet als die Leiblichkeit. Nach Kees lehnte Gregor diese Erklärung ab und folgte Methodius, für den die Felle die Sterblichkeit versinnbildlichen (V.2.5, S. 231, cf. S. 292). Die Auslegung des Origenes ist aber nicht so eindeutig. In *Selecta in Genesin* PG 12.101A gibt er verschiedene Erklärungen. 1. Eine wörtliche Interpretation ist Gottes unwürdig. 2. Es ist glaubhaft, dass die Felle den menschlichen Leib bedeuten, aber das bildet einen Kontrast zu Gen. 2,23, wo Adam spricht über Knochen und Fleisch, die zum Leib gehören. 3. Die Felle können die Sterblichkeit bedeuten, aber man kann sich fragen, warum Gott die Sterblichkeit geschaffen hat, und warum nicht die Sünde sie verursacht hat. In *Homiliae in Leviticum* 6.2 sind die Kleider ein Symbol der Sterblichkeit, die der Sünder wegen seiner Sünde empfängt, und der Zerbrechlichkeit, die aus der Korruptheit des Fleisches entstand. Sie bilden einen Kontrast zu den Kleidern der Unkorruptheit, das ist das Kleid des Hohepriesters (cf. Lev. 8,7). Gregor von Nazianz interpretiert die Felle als das dicke, sterbliche und rebellische Fleisch (*Oratio* 38.12, 45.8). Für die Gnostiker ist das Kleid aus Fellen das wahrnehmbare Fleisch (Irenaeus *Adversus Haereses* I.5.5.). Ich meine, dass es zu einfach ist, zu konkludieren, dass Gregor von Nyssa die Auslegung von Methodius übernommen hat. Es stellt sich m.E. heraus, dass die Exegese der Felle als Sterblichkeit ein Teil der christlichen Tradition war. Es wäre besser gewesen, wenn der Verfasser auch die Exegese anderer christlicher Autoren einbezogen hätte.

Die Studie von Kees ist eine gründliche, systematische Darstellung von Gregors theologischen Gedanken. Die *or cat* eignet sich sehr als Ausgangspunkt, sich dem theologischen Denken Gregors zu nähern, weil er darin seine theologischen Auffassungen systematisch entfaltet hat. Wenn man ein

Werk als Zugang zum Denken eines Theologen nimmt, hat man den Vorteil, dass man den Kontext berücksichtigen kann. Dies tut Kees, und er zieht auch andere Werke Gregors heran, wobei er auf eine Entwicklung in Gregors Denken hinsichtlich spezieller Themen aufmerksam macht. Christliche Vorgänger Gregors, nämlich Origenes, Methodius und Athanasius, werden in die Untersuchung einbezogen, und der Verfasser beobachtet Parallelen und Unterschiede. Er kann so das Denken Gregors besser verstehen. Das Buch bietet also mehr als der Titel vermuten lässt.[2]

[1] Die Ziffern zwischen Klammern verweisen nach Teilen und Kapiteln des Buches.

[2] Geschrieben mit finanzieller Hilfe der Niederländischen Organisation für wissenschaftliche Forschung (NWO). Ich danke Frau A. Vorthoren für die Korrektur meines Deutsch.

Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, Faculteit der Wijsbegeerte A.C. GELJON

Codex Bezae. Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994, edited by D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux (New Testament Tools and Studies, Volume XXII). E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1996. XXX, 383 pages.

Codex Bezae is a bilingual (Greek and Latin) manuscript of the four Gospels and Acts written in the fifth century. Its text often deviates from that of Greek uncials written at about the same time. This type of text, of both Gospels and Acts, was originally called "Western" because of its agreement with that of the Old-Latin (i.e. pre-Vulgate) manuscripts. Later it appeared that many readings of Codex Bezae and the Old-Latin agree with the Old-Syriac (i.e. pre-Peshitto) text. About sixty years ago this caused a lively debate. The Dutch scholar Daniel Plooy strongly defended the influence of a Syriac Harmony of the Gospels on both the Old-Latin and Old-Syriac text. However, this hypothesis took no account of the Greek text of Codex Bezae.

During the last fifty years the study of textual criticism has shown a considerable development. The main interest is no longer focused on the relation between and the mutual influence on various striking variant readings, the texts of manuscripts and early Christian authors, but on the value and origin of the individual reading. Therefore it was appropriate that in 1992 D.C. Parker devoted a monograph to an individual manuscript like

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Codex Bezae. His work attracted the interest of textual critics, among others C.-B. Amphoux, who held ideas different from those of Parker. This difference of opinion asked for a colloquium, which was held in Lunel.

Parker launched the idea that Codex Bezae was written in Berytus. This has not remained undisputed and, therefore, the organisers invited some bibliographical experts, like J. Irigoin, L. Holtz and others, to go into this question. Their profound studies did not solve the question and the answer seems to be further away than ever. In the Introduction it is said that the invitation of paleographers and textual critics did not appear to be as productive as it was supposed to be.

However, the book begins with an excellent survey of the state of affairs written by J.N. Birdsall. After the bibliographical contributions the book contains a number of extremely scholarly articles on various subjects dealing with the sometimes remarkable textual readings in the Gospels and Acts. We may mention, among others, that of B.D. Ehrman on the text of the second century, J.K. Elliott on the relation with some early papyri and on the Latin text of Codex Bezae by J.-M. Auwers. Two conclusions can be drawn, viz. that the striking readings in Codex Bezae are usually intentional and show a character that can be compared with the second and third century text of the Gospels and Acts as it is, for example, reflected in writers like Justin Martyr.

The organisers are hoping that the contents of this book may stimulate a wider interest in the text of Codex Bezae. In reaction to this wish we may say that we are missing summaries of the discussions held after each individual contribution, which seem to have been "encouraging and fruitful," according to the Introduction. We would have liked to read something about the text of Codex Bezae in the light of recent discoveries and studies of the text of the Gospel of Thomas and Jewish Christian Gospels. We miss a discussion about the text in the light of the still intriguing text of the "Caesarean Manuscripts" because of their apparently common background in the East. And we should have liked in Part Four, Responses and Conclusions, reflections on the contents of the contributions with a view on the state of affairs after this colloquium more than the present interesting, but individual remarks of Parker and Amphoux. Nevertheless we sincerely wish that this book will stimulate the study of Codex Bezae.

9751 NG *Haren*, Dilgtveg 18 A A.F.J. KLIJN

Kristoffel Demoen, *Pagan and biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen. A Study in Rhetoric and Hermeneutica* (Corpus Christianorum, Lingua Patrum II). Turnhout, Brepols, 1996. 498 S.

Die Studie, welche Demoen den *exempla* in den Werken des Gregor von Nazianz gewidmet hat, ist eine überarbeitete Fassung seiner 1993 an der Universität Gent verteidigten Doktorarbeit. Die Schriften dieses kappadokischen Kirchenvaters—namentlich die Poesie, die nicht weniger als 17.000 Verse umfasst—bieten eine beträchtliche Menge Material für eine derartige Arbeit. Die zahlreichen Entlehnungen, die der Nazianzener der profanen Literatur entnimmt, übertreffen bei weitem jene, die man bei seinen Zeitgenossen Basilius und Gregor von Nyssa findet. So lassen sich bei den *exempla* die profanen Vorbilder den biblischen gegenüberstellen.

Demoens Studie besteht aus zwei Teilen. Im ersten wird das *exemplum* oder *paradigma* anhand der profanen rhetorischen Theorie analysiert, eine für die eingehende Erläuterung der Verwendung bei Gregor notwendige Arbeit, da das *exemplum* sowohl auf dem Gebiete der Stilistik als auf dem der Argumentation mehrere Funktionen hat. Im zweiten Teil werden die hermeneutischen Aspekte besprochen. Unter den Verwendungsweisen der mythologischen und biblischen *exempla* ist die typologische stark vertreten. Demoen hat der Behandlung des *exemplums* in den rhetorischen Abhandlungen und Handbüchern seit Aristoteles grosse Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet. Was da über die Funktion und Verwendungsweise des *exemplums* gesagt wird, war dem Gregor, der durch seine Ausbildung mit allen Aspekten der Rhetorik gründlich vertraut war, geläufig. Das bezeugt die Art und Weise, wie er sowohl die heidnischen als die biblischen *exempla* verwendet. Mit Recht betont der Autor in seiner Analyse, dass die biblischen *exempla* bei Gregor namentlich eine Vorbildfunktion haben, während die paganen *paradigmata*, besonders die mythologischen, mehr als stilistisches Ornament verwendet werden. Ist in formaler Hinsicht die Verwendung der biblischen und paganen *exempla* nahezu identisch, durch die Aktualisierung der biblischen Ereignisse ist deren Bedeutung ganz verschieden. Letztere findet man besonders in den autobiographischen Gedichten, da Gregor seine eigene Geschichte als eine Wiederholung der Heilsgeschichte darstellt.

Die Sekundärliteratur ist sorgfältig benutzt worden, und gegebenfalls werden Parallelen bei anderen christlichen Schriftstellern verzeichnet. Für die Gigantomachie (die Aloaden stapeln die Ossa auf den Pelion, um so den Olymp bestürmen zu können), wo der Autor auf Euseb, *Praep. ev.* 9,18 (= 9,14,2) verweist (S. 293[254]), wäre auch ein Hinweis auf Pseudo-Justin,

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Cohortatio ad gentes 28 (*Gen.* 11,1-9—Homer, *Ilias* 19,126-131) möglich gewesen. Für den proverbialen Ausdruck χρύσεα χαλκείων (S. 392) sehe man z.B. *Hermeneus* 27 (1956), 148-153. S. 393 lese man Αἰακίδαι statt Αἰκακίδαι.

Demoens klargegliederte Studie, in der mehrere ausführliche Register in beispielhafter Weise die Fülle des verarbeiteten Materials erschliessen, enthält auch manche scharfsinnige Bemerkung über problematische Stellen. Sah Gallay zum Beispiel in einer Stelle bei Gregor eine Anspielung auf die Legende des Icarus (S. 390), Demoen bringt diese Stelle über den Verlust der Flügel, aufgrund der Verwendung des Verbums πτερορρυεῖν mit gutem Recht mit Platons *Phaedrus* in Verbindung. Beispielhaft ist Demoens Behandlung der Stelle *Carm.* I,1,6 Verse 58-66 (S. 390-391). Der Kern der Probleme liegt in Vers 59. In kontrastierender Parallelität spricht Gregor über die Sündenvergebung im Alten Testament, die er nachher mit den *exempla* David und Moses verdeutlicht: David wurde nur in geringem Masse (ἐνδεῶς) für seine Sünden bestraft, Moses dagegen durfte wegen eines leichten Vergehens selber das Heilige Land nicht betreten. Demoens Wiedergabe von Vers 64 (vgl. auch PG 37,434, Notiz zu Vers 65) ist überzeugend. In Vers 59 würde man aufgrund der Parallelität die Lesart κακῶν erwarten. In den Hss. überwiegt jedoch καλῶν, eine Lesart, die auch Sicherl in seinen textkritischen Untersuchungen über Gregors Gedichten beibehalten möchte. Bei den Maurinern lesen wir

58 Τὰ μὲν μέγιστα τῶν κακῶν συγγνωστά πως.
59 Τὰ δ'οὐ μέγιστα τῶν κακῶν τιμητέα.

Demoen betrachtet καλῶν nicht als *gen. part.* (in der Ausgabe der Mauriner übersetzt: *culpae non maximae* = *non maximae culparum*) sondern als *gen. subj.*: "And not too great (crimes) of good people were to be punished." Behält man die Lesart καλῶν bei, dann muss das wohl die richtige Übersetzung sein, mag sie auch etwas forciert scheinen. Dagegen hat die Textänderung den Vorzug, dass sie weniger kompliziert ist und eine Parallele zu dem vorhergehenden κακῶν bildet, so dass die endgültige Entscheidung schwierig bleibt.

Zu den wenigen Untersuchungen über die Verwendung der *exempla* durch einen einzelnen christlichen Autor—wie jener von Hélène Pétré (Tertullian) und Schneiderhahns nicht publizierter Studie über Hieronymus—hat sich jetzt mit der grundlegenden Studie des Demoen ein Pendant aus dem griechischen Bereich gesellt.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. Bartelink

Origène, *Homélies sur les Nombres* I: Homélies I-X. Texte de W.A. Baehrens (G.C.S.). Nouvelle édition par Louis Doutreleau, s.j. d'après l'édition d'André Méhat et les notes de Marcel Borret, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 415). Paris Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 327 p. 191 F.

En 1951 M. André Méhat publia une traduction française des homélies sur les *Nombres* d'Origène, avec une Introduction à l'œuvre de l'auteur alexandrin. Le Père Doutreleau présente ici une nouvelle édition, munie du texte latin de Rufin. Cette édition avait été préparée par son confrère, le Père Marcel Borret, l'auteur bien connu de plusieurs volumes des *Sources Chrétiennes*, mort à la Noël de 1993. L'éditeur a donné "un ton unique" à la traduction, il a accompagné chaque homélie d'une brève notice, qui met en valeur la composition de l'homélie, et il a fait précéder le texte d'une introduction très brève sur l'auteur, le traducteur (Rufin), le texte et sa transmission, ainsi que sur les éditions.

Il a conservé la division traditionnelle du texte en chapitres, mais a ajouté une subdivision en paragraphes, ce qui facilite les renvois.

On admire la clarté du latin de Rufin, qui a été imprimé impeccablement. (Lire toutefois p. 168, l. 22 *videntur* au lieu de *videatur*.) La traduction me semble être de haute qualité. Les notes témoignent d'une connaissance approfondie de la pensée orígénienne.

L'éditeur a rendu accessible aux lecteurs modernes un texte fascinant d'Origène. On attend avec impatience les deux autres volumes, qui contiendront les homélies IX-XXV.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

1. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 12 (Pars II). Esaias edidit Roger Gryson (fasc. 5: Is. 46,13-50,3; fasc. 6: Is. 50,4-53,3; fasc. 7: Is. 53,3-54,17). Freiburg, Herder. 1995-1996, S. 1121-1360.

2. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 11/2. Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) herausgegeben von Walter Thiele (6. Lief.: Sir. 11,35-16,21). Freiburg, Herder. 1996, S. 401-480.

3. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 22. Epistula ad Corinthios 1 herausgegeben von Uwe Fröhlich (1. Lief.: Einleitung; 2. Lief.: Einleitung). Freiburg, Herder. 1996, S. 1-160.

4. *Vetus Latina. Fragmente zum Alten Testament. Die Pelagianische Epistula ad quandam matronam Christianam* zusammen mit U. Fröhlich und H. Stanjek

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

eingeleitet und herausgegeben von Hermann Josef Frede (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 28). Freiburg, Herder. 1996, 229 S.

5. *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe.* Introduction par R. Gryson. Livres VIII-XI. Texte établi par R. Gryson et V. Somers avec la collaboration de A. Bourgois et C. Gabriel (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 30). Freiburg, Herder. 1996, 388 S.

1. Von Grysons Esaias-Ausgabe liegen jetzt drei weitere Lieferungen vor. Der Reichtum der Varianten frappiert immer wieder den Benutzer. So stehen zum Beispiel neben der Lesart *placito* der Vulgata (49,8 *tempore placito*) *aptissimo, accepto, acceptabili* und *opportuno*. Und in 49,13 (Vulgata: *laudate*) finden wir *exulta, laetare, iocundare, laetamini, laetentur*, und *laudant te*. Mit jeder neuen Lieferung, immer wieder mit der grössten Genauigkeit produziert, kommt reichhaltiges Material zur Verfügung.
2. Von Thieles Sirach-Ausgabe ist jetzt die sechste Lieferung erschienen. Inzwischen hat Raymond Etaix einen unbekannten Sirachtext (1,1-2,23 unfassend) in der Pariser Bibliothèque Nationale entdeckt. Das wichtige Fragment ist eine Sirachlesung im altlateinischen Wortlaut aus einem Lektionar für den 14. Sonntag nach Pfingsten (Par. Lat. 1019). Auf Grund einer Liste von einigen Varianten konnte ihn Thiele zugleich als dem Texttyp J zugehörig identifizieren. "Er füllt eine Lücke in der Überlieferung, die Thiele im Nachtrag zu seiner Edition behandeln wird, bietet aber nichts grundsätzlich Neues oder Widersprechendes."
3. Band 22 der Vetus Latina-Edition—besorgt von Uwe Fröhlich—wird die Ausgabe des ersten Korintherbriefes umfassen. Die jetzt erschienenen zwei Lieferungen enthalten einen grossen Teil der Einleitung, die der Darstellung der handschriftlichen Überlieferung gewidmet ist. Es hat sich ergeben, dass die Textgeschichte des ersten Korintherbriefes untrennbar mit jener der übrigen Briefe verquickt ist. Unter den besprochenen Handschriften befinden sich berühmte wie der Wolffenbütteler Palimpsest-Codex Weissenburgensis 76 (ein altgallikanisches Lektionar des 5./6. Jhts.) und der aus Böhmen stammende *Gigas librorum*, der sich seit dem Dreissigjährigen Krieg in der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Stockholm befindet.
4. Im 28. Band der Serie *Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* werden einige neue Vetus Latina-Fragmente veröffentlicht. Es handelt sich um alttestamentliche Fragmente, die in den vergangenen Jahren von einigen Forschern entdeckt und identifiziert worden sind. Das heterogene, aber besonders interessante Material wurde Frede, dem Spezialisten auf die-

sem Gebiete, zur Veröffentlichung angeboten. In Mailand hatte Mirella Ferrari ein Palimpsestblatt entdeckt, das einen bisher fehlenden Teil der Vetus Latina-Handschrift 165 enthält. Der unterliegende Text besteht aus einer Reihe von Versen aus dem Buch der Sprüche. Im 8. Jahrhundert wurde dieser Text gewischt und ein pelagianisches Werk, die *Epistula ad quandam matronam Christianam*, darüber geschrieben. Das Blatt vervollständigt den bisher lückenhaft überlieferten Text. Ausserdem ist jetzt die Reihenfolge der Blätter klar. Bernhard Bischoff, der unermüdliche Erforscher von mitteralterlichen Handschriften, stiess auf Fragmente der Makkabäerbücher und auf Reste einer alten Prophetenhandschrift. Bei seinen Untersuchungen über Lektionare entdeckte Raymond Etaix ein Pariser Lektionar (13. Jht.) mit einem Sirachtext aus dem 5. Jahrhundert. Er fand ebenfalls zwei Texte verschiedenen Typs mit dem siebenten Abschnitt des zweiten Makkabäerbuches (Folterung und Tod der makkabäischen Brüder und ihrer Mutter).

5. Die Bücher VIII-XI des Jesajakommentars des Hieronymus umfassen die Abschnitte Jes. 24,1-40,26. Damit ist die langfristige Arbeit, die Gryson und Somers auf sich genommen haben, bis über die Hälfte fortgeschritten. Wie Gryson in seinem Vorwort bemerkt, markiert der Schluss von Buch XI einen klaren Bruch in der Überlieferung des Textes. Der Grund dieses Bruches ist unklar, weil dadurch nicht zwei etwa gleiche Teile gebildet werden und auch der Text keinen Schnitt rechtfertigt. Weiter ist zu bemerken, dass Hieronymus in seinem Jesajakommentar allmählich seine Arbeitsweise geändert hat. Während er anfangs von seiner eigenen Übersetzung aus dem Hebräischen ausging, erkannte er allmählich dem LXX-Text einen grösseren Platz zu. Vom 8. Buch an, bediente er sich der Methode, nach der er auch in seinen Kommentaren zu den 12 Propheten verfahren hatte: bei jeder Textstelle bietet er nacheinander die *veritas hebraica* und den geläufigen Text nach der LXX, woraufhin der Kommentar zu beiden Texten folgt.
   Die Einführung zu den Handschriften beschränkt sich auf die Handschriften, welche in Buch VIII zum ersten Mal verwendet werden und von denen noch nicht die Rede war. Wegen der Länge des Kommentars ist die Überlieferung öfters pro Buch sehr verschieden.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. Bartelink

Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt. Herausgegeben von Ernst Dassmann *et alii*, Band XVII: Iao-Indictio feriarum. Stuttgart, Anton Hiersemann 1996. 1300 Sp.

Das Alphabet, in dem hier die Buchstaben I und J *modo latino* zusammen genommen werden, hat wiederum eine Sammlung sehr interessanter Abhandlungen zusammengebracht. Dieser siebzehnte Band enthält die folgenden Stichwörter: Iao (Ἰαώ): David E. Aune; Iberia II (Georgien): Otar Lordkipanidse, Heinzgerd Brakmann; Ibis: Manfred Weber; Ich-bin-Worte: Hartwig Thyen; Idee (Ideenlehre): Matthias Baltes; Jenseits (Jenseits-vorstellungen): Carsten Colpe, Ernst Dassmann; Josef Engemann; Peter Habermehl, Karl Hoheisel; Jenseitsfahrt I (Himmelfahrt): Carsten Colpe, Ernst Dassmann, Josef Engemann, Peter Habermehl; Jenseitsfahrt II (Unterwelts- oder Höllenfahrt): Carsten Colpe; Jenseitsreise (Reise durch das Jenseits): Carsten Colpe, Peter Habermehl; Jeremia: Ernst Dassmann; Jerusalem I (Stadtgeschichtlich): Ute Wagner-Lux, Heinzgerd Brakmann; Jerusalem II (Sinnbild): Klaus Thraede; Jesaja: Pierre Jay; Jesus II (im Zauber): David E. Aune; Jesus (Ausserchristlich): Karl Hoheisel; Jesus Sirach: Maurice Gilbert; Jeu: David E. Aune; Igel (Stacheltiere; Klippschliefer): Franz Witek; Ignatius von Antiochien: Henning Paulsen †; Illustration: Barbara Zimmermann, Jürgen Hammerstaedt; Imagines Maiorum: Christa Belting-Ihm; Imago clipeata: Josef Engemann; Immanenz u. Transzendenz: Abraham P. Bos; Immunitas: Alfred Hübner; Imperium: Georg Klingenberg; Imperium Romanum: Hans Armin Gärtner; Improperia: Albert Gerhards; Improvisation: Jürgen Hammerstaedt, Peri Terbuyken.

"Gottesnamen hatten für die Zauberformeln der Antike zentrale Bedeutung" (Sp. 5). In drei Artikeln werden derartige Namen erörtert, nämlich "Iao" (die bisyllabische Transcription einer verkürzten Form des traditionellen hebräischen Gottesnamens JHWH), "Jeu" (vielleicht eine Variante von Iao) und "Jesus II", in dem der Name Jesu im Zauber behandelt wird.

Vier grosse Beiträge beschäftigen sich mit der Idee des Jenseits: "Jenseitsvorstellungen", "Jenseitsfahrt" als "Himmelfahrt" und als "Unterwelts- und Höllenfahrt" und "Jenseitsreise".

Drei alttestamentliche Bücher werden auf ihre Wirkungsgeschichte untersucht: "Jeremia", "Jesaja" und "Jesus Sirach". Ein Vergleich zeigt deutlich, dass das Jesaja-Buch häufiger zitiert und kommentiert wird. Der Verf. (P. Jay) gibt eine interessante übersicht der Jesaja Texte, die am meisten in der patristischen Literatur benutzt worden sind.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Im Artikel "Ich-bin-Worte" bespricht der Verf. (H. Thyen), in der Spur von Norden und Schweizer, diese häufige Selbstvorstellungsformel. Norden hat die These aufgestellt, dass diese Formel ein in der antiken Welt weit verbreiteter, soteriologischer Redetypus orientalischer Provenienz ist. Der Verf. ist damit einverstanden und spricht von einem "unhellenischen Charakter" der Ich-Bin-Worte. Nach Lesung dieses höchst interressanten Beitrags, bleibt bei mir die Frage, ob man tatsächlich von einer ursächlichen Beziehung zwischen den orientalischen und biblischen Formeln sprechen muss. Is diese Selbstvorstellungsformel nicht eine dermassen primäre Ausdrucksform für jemanden, der sich präsentieren will, dass sie an verschiedenen Stellen selbständig aufkommen kann? In diesem Fall sollte man hier eigentlich nicht von einer Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt sprechen. Es handelt sich dann um zwei parallele Erscheinungen.

Eine richtige Auseinandersetzung bietet sich dar in den Artikeln "Idee (Ideenlehre)" und "Immanenz und Transzendenz". Der Verf. des erstgenannten Artikels (M. Baltes) zeigt deutlich, wie Platons Ideenlehre das Denken der frühchristlichen Autoren beeinflusst hat. Teils damit parallel läuft die Auseinandersetzung über "Immanenz und Transzendenz", in der der Hauptakzent auf Transzendenz liegt. Diese Transzendenz findet man natürlich vor allem in Platons Welt der Ideen, in der die Seinsphilosophie des Parmenides ihren Höhepunkt erreicht. Der Verf. (A.P. Bos) gibt eine eindringliche Beschreibung der Entwicklung dieser Philosophie und zeigt, wie sie bei Philo und den frühchristlichen Autoren zu einer philosophischen Theologie geführt hat. Der Verf. steht dieser Entwicklung, die oft mit dem Terminus Hellenisierung (des Judentums c.q. des Christentums) angedeutet wird, kritisch gegenüber. Er bemerkt selber: "Wie die modernen Forscher das Resultat dieser Bemühungen beurteilen, hängt von den jeweiligen religiösen und philosophischen Einstellung dieser Forscher ab" (Sp. 1072). Aber wie dem auch sei, der Verf. hat den gang dieser "Bemühungen" sehr genau beschrieben. Eine kleine Bemerkung: Sp. 1078 sagt er, dass nach Justin die griech. Philosophenschulen ihren Ursprung darin haben, dass der Logos Menschen in der Wahrheit unterrichtet hat, und verweist dann nach Dial. 2,2. Aber Justin sagt dort, dass die griechischen Philosophenschulen dadurch entstanden sind, dass sie die eine Philosophie die zu den Menschen niedergesandt wurde, nicht verstanden haben. Über den Logos spricht Justin hier nicht ausdrücklich, obwohl man vermuten darf, dass die niedergesandte Philosophie das Werk des Logos ist.

Die übrigen Stichworte sollen für sich sprechen. Anlässlich der Abhand-

lung über "Improperia" sei noch bemerkt, dass der Verf. (A. Gerhards), wo er die Improperia des Missale Romanum für Karfreitag behandelt, sechs Mal über die Antiphon oder den Rahmvers "Populus meus . . ." spricht (Sp. 1199, 2 mal, 1207, 1209 2 mal, 1210). Das soll "Popule meus" sein. Jahwe oder Christus spricht das Volk an; das muss in einen Vokativ resultieren.

Mit diesem 17. Band wird ein grosses Unternehmen in vorzüglicher Weise fortgesetzt.

2312 GD Leiden, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

BOOKS RECEIVED

The inclusion of a book in this list, which contains all books received by the editors, does not guarantee its subsequent review.

Amsler, Frédéric; Bovon, François, and Bouvier, Bertrand (edd.), *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe* (Apocryphes 8). Turnhout: Brepols, 1996. 318 pp. ISBN 2-503-50422-1. Price BFr 774.

Andia, Ysabel de, *Henosis: l'union à Dieu chez Denys l'Aréopagite* (Philosophia Antiqua 71). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1996. 510 pp. ISBN 90-04-1-656-1. Price NGL 285.50, US $178.50.

Athanasius Werke. Erster Band. Erster Teil (Die dogmatischen Schriften), 1. Lieferung: Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae, Herausgegeben von Martin Tetz. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1996. xxxii + 64 pp. ISBN 3-11-015116-2. Price DM 78.

Blanc, Cécile (ed.), *Origène Commentaire sur Saint Jean Tome I (Livres I-V)*, Deuxième édition revue et corrigée (Sources Chrétiennes 120 bis). Paris: Les éditions du CERF, 1996. 420 pp. ISBN 2-204-05382-1. 290 F.

Blásquez, José María, *España Romana* (Colección Historia Serie Mayor). Madrid: Cátedra, 468 pp. ISBN 84-376-1460-0.

Broek, Roelof van der, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity* (Nag Hammadi Studies 39). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1996. ix + 300 pp. ISBN 90-04-10654-5. Price NLG 178.–, US $111.50.

Butterweck, Christel, *Athanasius von Alexandrien Bibliographie*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1996. 408 pp. ISBN 3-531-05108-3. Price DM 148.

Cacciari, Antonio, *La securitas in S. Agostino*. Florence: Opus libri, 1995. 149 pp. Price Lire 40,000.

Campliani, Alberto (ed.), *L'egitto cristiano: aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 56). Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1997. 358 pp. ISBN 88-7961-041-4. Price Lire 60,000.

Carrecedo Fraga, J. (ed.), *Liber de ortu et obitu patriarcharum* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 158). Turnhout: Brepols, 1996. 67* + 132 pp. ISBN 2-503-50511-2.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Crüsemann, Frank, *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996. xv + 406 pp. ISBN 0-567-08524-4. Price £24.95.

Draper, Jonathan A. (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 37). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1996. xviii + 445 pp. ISBN 90-04-10375-9. Price NLG 238.50, US $149.50.

Dufraigne, Pierre, *Adventus Augusti, adventus Christi: recherche sur l'exploitation idéologique et littéraire d'un cérémonial dans l'antiquité tardive* (Collection des Etudes Augustiniennes: Série Antiquité 141). Institut d'Etudes Augustiniennes, 1994. 520 pp. ISBN 2-85121-141-2. Price BFr 1882.

Étaix, Raymond, *Homéliaires patristiques latins: recueil d'études de manuscrits médiévaux* (Collection des Etudes Augustiniennes: Série Moyen-Âge et Temps modernes 29). Paris: Institut d'Etudes Augustiniennes, 1996. xix + 699 pp. ISBN 2-85121-140-4. Price BFr 2420.

Évieux, Pierre, *Isidore de Péluse* (Théologie Historique 99). Paris: Beauchesne, 1995. xxvii + 444 pp. ISBN 2-7010-1301-1. Price FFr 282.

Frede, Hermann Josef, and Stanjek, Herbert (edd.), *Sedulii Scotti collectaneum in apostolum: I. In epistolam ad Romanos* (Vetus Latina Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 31). Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1996. 59* + 346 pp. ISBN 3-451-21952-2.

Fuhrer, Therese (ed.), *Augustin Contra Academicos* (Patristische Texte und Studien 46). Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. x + 532 pp. ISBN 3-11-015204-5.

Gryson, Roger (ed.), *Vetus Latina: die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel; 12 (Pars II) Esaias, fascicule 8 Is 54,17-58,7.* Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1996. pp. 1361-1440. ISBN 3-451-00128-4.

Harvey, Graham, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 35). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1996. xvii + 303 pp. ISBN 90-04-10617-0. Price NLG 165, US $106.50.

Herzog, Markwart, *Descensus ad inferos. Eine religionsphilosophische Untersuchung der Motive und Interpretationen mit besondere Berücksichtigung der monographischen Literatur seit dem 16. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurter Theologische Studien 53). Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 1997. xii + 522 pp. ISBN 3-7820-0759-X.

Hombert, Pierre-Marie, *Gloria gratiae: se glorifier en Dieu, principe et fin de la théologie augustinienne de la grâce* (Collection des Etudes Augustiniennes: Série Antiquité 148). Paris: Institut d'Etudes Augustiniennes, 1996. xi + 664 pp. ISBN 2-85121-153-6. Price BFr 1260.

Horst, P.W. van der, *Bronnen voor de studie van de wereld van het vroege christendom: Joodse en pagane teksten uit de periode van Alexander de Grote tot keizer Constantijn: Deel 1 Joodse bronnen; Deel 2 Pagane bronnen.* Kampen: Kok, 1997. 268 + 272 pp. ISBN 90-242-7963-1.

Jefford, Clifford (with Kenneth J. Harder and Louis D. Amezaga, Jr.), *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: an Introduction.* Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1996. xv + 192 pp. ISBN 1-56563-154-4.

Kloppenborg, John S., and Wilson, Stephen G. (edd.), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World.* London-New York: Routledge, 1996. xvii + 333 pp. ISBN 0-415-13593-1. Price £50 (hb).

Larchet, Jean-Claude, *La divinisation de l'homme selon Saint Maxime le Confesseur* (Théologie et sciences religieuses. Cogitatio fidei 194). Paris: Les éditions du CERF, 1996. 764 pp. ISBN 2-204-05249-3. Price 350 FFr.

Liere, Franciscus A. van (ed.), *Andreae de Sancto Victore Opera* (Corpus Christianorum

Continuatio Mediaevalis 53A). Turnhout: Brepols, 1996. cxxxiv + 158 pp. ISBN 2-503-03534-5. Price BFr 4250 (broché).

Lieu, Judith, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996. xiv + 348 pp. ISBN 0-567-085249-5. Price £24.95.

Lieu, Samuel N.C., and Montserrat, Dominic (edd.), *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views*. London-New York: Routledge, 1996. xxi + 285 pp. ISBN 0-415-09335-X, 0-415-09336-8 (pb). Price £40 (hb), £13.99 (pb).

Linage Conde, Antonio, *San Benito y los Benedictinos*. Braga: Edição de Irmandade de S. Bento da Porta Aberta, 1991-93. 7 volumes. xxxi + 4471 pp.

Moatti-Fine, Jacqueline, *La Bible d'Alexandrie 6: Jésus (Josué)*. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1996. 258 pp. ISBN 2-204-05429-1.

Pasini, Cesare, *Ambrogio di Milano: Azione e pensiero di un vescovo*. Milan: Edizioni San Paolo, 1996. 271 pp. ISBN 88-215-3303-4. Price Lire 32,000.

Passion de Perpétue et de Félicité, suivi des Actes, Introduction, texte critique, traduction, commentaire et index par Jacqueline Amat (Sources Chrétiennes 417). Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 318 pp. ISBN 2-204-05386-4. Price FFr 293.

Perrone, Lorenzo *et al.* (edd.), *Adamantius: Newsletter of the Italian Research group on "Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition."* Pisa: 1996. 84 pp.

Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Band 17 (Lieferungen 129-136), Herausgegeben von Ernst Dassmann. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann Verlag, 1996. 1300 cols. ISBN 3-7772-9611-1. Price 490 DM.

Rebenich, Stefan, *Theodor Mommsen und Adolf Harnack: Wissenschaft und Politik im Berlin des ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts. Mit einem Anhang: Edition und Kommentierung des Briefwechsels*. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. xxi + 1018 pp. ISBN 3-11-015079-4.

Rivero García, Luis, *La poesía de Prudencio*. Universidad de Huelva: Huelva; Universidad de Extremadura: Cáceres: 1996. 312 pp. ISBN 84-88751-42-7.

Runia, David T. (ed.), *The Studia Philonica Annual volume VIII* (Brown Judaic Series 309). Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1996. viii + 228 pp. ISBN 0-7885-0311-1. Price $34.95 (hb).

Sardella, Teresa, *Società chiesa e stato nell'età di Teoderico: Papa Simmaco e lo scisma laurenziano* (Armarium: Biblioteca di storia e cultura religiosa 7). Soveria Mannelli—Messina: Rubbettino Editore, 1996. 221 pp. ISBN 88-7284-494-0. Price 20,000 Lire.

Sozomène Histoire Ecclésiastique Livres III-IV, Introduction et Annotation par Guy Sabbah, traduction par †André-Jean Festugière, revue par Bernard Grillet (Sources Chrétiennes 418). Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 394 pp. ISBN 2-204-05617-0. Price FFr 275.

Tardieu, Michel, and Hadot, Pierre, *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus // "Porphyre et Victorinus." Questions et Hypothèses* (Res Orientales 9). Bures-sur-Yvette: Groupe pour l'Étude de la Civilisation du Moyen-Orient, 1996. 156 pp. ISBN 2-9508266-3-6.

VanderKam, James C., and Adler, William (edd.), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Assen-Minneapolis: Van Gorcum and Fortress Press, 1996. xii + 286 pp. ISBN 90-232-2913-4. Price NLG 80.

Vregille S.J., Bernard de, and Neyrand S.J., Louis (edd.), *Apponius Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques (livres I-III)* (Sources Chrétiennes 420). Paris: Les éditions du CERF, 1997. 386 pp. ISBN 2-204-05527-1. Price FFr 261.

L'OBSCURCISSEMENT DU SOLEIL EN PLEIN JOUR. QUELQUES RÉFLEXIONS DES PÈRES COMMENTATEURS DE LA SEPTANTE DES PROPHÈTES

PAR

LAURENCE BROTTIER

Plusieurs péricopes du *Dodekapropheton* (Am 8, 9; Jl 2, 10; 3, 4 (2, 31); 4 (3), 15; Za 14, 5-7) annoncent l'obscurcissement du soleil en plein jour. Ces textes énigmatiques ont stimulé l'activité herméneutique des Pères grecs. On voit apparaître ces versets à travers la littérature patristique dans des genres littéraires fort différents, des catéchèses à la correspondance, de l'apologétique à l'homélie de circonstance. La présente étude prend en compte, outre des exégèses ponctuelles, les commentaires continus des Antiochiens et de Cyrille d'Alexandrie ainsi que les scholies inédites d'Hésychius de Jérusalem. Les versets en question sont éclairés soit par le Nouveau Testament qui permet de voir en eux une annonce des bouleversements liés à la Passion du Christ, soit par une réflexion psychologique qui les considère comme l'expression des plus extrêmes bouleversements de l'âme humaine.

Nombreuses sont les prophéties qui mettent en scène, de manière plus ou moins énigmatique, le "jour du Seigneur" (ἡμέρα κυρίου).[1] Les commentateurs ont tenté d'expliciter ces évocations et de les référer à des réalités accessibles à leurs auditeurs ou à leurs lecteurs. L'un des prodiges qui marquent ce jour a particulièrement suscité les exégèses: l'obscurcissement du soleil et l'absence de lumière en plein jour.[2]

---

[1] Sur cette expression, voir Hatch-Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, Graz, 1954, *s.v.*

[2] Un prodige cosmique du même ordre, bouleversant les catégories temporelles et les repères habituels du jour et de la nuit, est présent dans la mythologie païenne et même dans l'histoire romaine revue par l'épopée. Le festin de Thyeste d'une part, la guerre civile d'autre part, auraient provoqué un recul du soleil et plongé l'humanité, en plein jour, dans la nuit. Ce thème a été minutieusement analysé par F. Delarue ("Thyeste de Varius," in *Mélanges H. Bardon*, Bruxelles, 1985, p. 100-123) que je remercie d'avoir attiré mon attention sur ce phénomène proche de celui qui nous occupe. Même si une épigramme de Statylius Flaccus (*Anthologie Palatine* IX, 98) fait remonter à Sophocle le thème du recul solaire devant le festin de Thyeste, la tradition grecque a généralement lié ce prodige à un autre épisode: il corroborerait l'élection divine d'Atrée au trône de Mycènes, signifiée par l'agneau d'or et mettant ainsi fin à la rivalité entre les deux frères

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997 *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, 339-58

Après avoir présenté les prophéties en question et les différents types d'œuvres où elles sont commentées, on s'intéressera aux deux principales orientations exégétiques: l'une, théologique, voit dans ces passages des annonces de la Passion du Christ; l'autre, psychologique, comprend ces versets au sens figuré.

I. *Présentation*

1. *Les prophéties*

C'est essentiellement dans le *Dodekapropheton* que se trouvent les prophéties annonciatrices du jour où le soleil se couchera en plein midi. Ainsi, on lit en Amos 8, 9: "Et il arrivera en ce jour-là, dit le Seigneur Dieu, que le soleil se couchera à midi (δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος μεσημβρίας) et que la lumière s'obscurcira sur la terre en plein jour (συσκοτάσει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τὸ φῶς)." Joël étend à l'ensemble des astres le phénomène: "Le soleil et la lune s'obscurciront (ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη συσκοτάσουσιν) et les étoiles cacheront leur éclat (τὰ ἄστρα δύσουσιν τὸ φέγγος αὐτῶν);"[3] "Le soleil se transformera en obscurité et la lune en sang (ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα)."[4] Plus complexe est l'évocation de ce jour par le prophète Zacharie: "Le Seigneur mon Dieu sera là, et tous les saints avec lui. En ce jour-là, il n'y aura pas de lumière (οὐκ ἔσται φῶς); il y aura froid et gelée (καὶ ψῦχος καὶ πάγος ἔσται) pendant un seul jour;[5] et ce jour

---

(par ex. Euripide, *Iphigénie en Tauride* 812-816; pour d'autres références, voir *art. cit.*, n. 38). En revanche, la poésie latine lie traditionnellement le recul du soleil et l'effroi devant la vengeance d'Atrée servant à son frère Thyeste la chair de ses enfants (par ex. Properce, *Élégies* III, 22, 30; Ovide, *Amours* III, 12, 39; Manilius, *Astronomiques* III, 18-19; Martial, *Épigrammes* III, 45, 1; Sénèque, *Thyeste* 1035-1036; Stace, *Thébaïde* IV, 304-308; nombreuses autres occurrences: voir *art. cit.*, p. 116-117) ou devant la haine fratricide, symbole de la guerre civile (par ex. Lucain, qui ne mentionne plus l'épisode du banquet: *Pharsale* I, 540-544). C'est le même phénomène, provoqué par une attitude similaire, qui aurait bouleversé l'humanité à l'aube de Pharsale (*ibid.*, VII, 1-6).

[3] La même formule revient à deux reprises: 2, 10 et 4 (3), 15. Nous suivons la numérotation de l'édition d'A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart, 1935; celle qu'a adoptée J. Ziegler (*Duodecim Prophetae.* XIII, Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum Gottingensis editum, Göttingen, 1943, 3e éd. 1984) est indiquée entre parenthèses.

[4] 3, 4 (2, 31).

[5] On ne suivra pas ici Rahlfs et Ziegler qui ponctuent après πάγος ("En ce jour-là, il n'y aura pas de lumière, et du froid, et de la gelée; ce sera pendant un seul jour"), contrairement à la lecture unanime des Pères (voir *infra*, p. 342 et 345).

sera connu du Seigneur; ce ne sera ni un jour ni une nuit (οὐχ ἡμέρα καὶ οὐ νύξ), et vers le soir, il y aura de la lumière (καὶ πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἔσται φῶς)."[6] Le seul grand prophète qui évoque le même prodige est Jérémie, pour exprimer le malheur de la mère qui voit ses fils mourir à la guerre: "Le soleil s'est couché pour elle (ἐπέδυ ὁ ἥλιος αὐτῇ) alors que c'était encore le milieu du jour (ἔτι μεσούσης τῆς ἡμέρας)."[7]

2. *Les commentaires*

Avant d'aborder la teneur des commentaires, il n'est sans doute pas inopportun de rappeler par quels Pères grecs et surtout dans quels types d'œuvres ces versets ont été interprétés.

On soulignera d'abord combien le verset de Jérémie a été peu interprété. Même Origène, dans les homélies qu'il consacre à ce prophète, ne s'y intéresse pas. Présent dans des dossiers scripturaires chez Irénée[8] ou chez le Pseudo-Grégoire de Nysse,[9] expliqué au fil du commentaire continu de Théodoret[10] et des scholies d'Olympiodore,[11] ce verset semble bien n'avoir eu de vie qu'à l'intérieur de la polémique ou de l'exégèse systématique. Il en va tout autrement des péricopes du *Dodekapropheton.*

On possède en grec trois commentaires continus du *Dodekapropheton*, œuvres de deux Antiochiens, Théodore de Mopsueste[12] et Théodoret de Cyr,[13] et d'un Alexandrin, Cyrille.[14] En outre, on a, sous le nom d'Hésychius de Jérusalem, un ensemble de scholies considérées comme authentiques[15]

---

[6] Za 14, 5-7.

[7] Jér 15, 9.

[8] *Adu. haereses* IV, 33, 12, éd. A. Rousseau, B. Hemmerdinger, C. Mercier et L. Doutreleau, SC 100, 2, Paris, 1965, p. 836-837.

[9] *Testimonia aduersus Iudaeos* VII, PG 46, 213-215. J. Daniélou ("Bulletin d'histoire des origines chrétiennes," *RSR* 44 (1956), p. 621) penche pour l'authenticité nysséenne de ces *Testimonia.* Grégoire pourrait même les avoir utilisés dans la *Vie de Moïse.* J. Daniélou fait remarquer la leçon αἷμα στάξαντα présente à la fois dans certains manuscrits de la *Vie de Moïse* (II, 270) et dans les *Testimonia* (213D) pour évoquer le Christ crucifié.

[10] *Interpretatio in Ieremiam*, PG 81, 495-806.

[11] *Fragmenta in Ieremiam*, PG 93, 661.

[12] *Commentarius in XII Prophetas*, éd. H.-N. Sprenger, Wiesbaden, 1977.

[13] PG 81, 1545-1988.

[14] *Scti Patris Nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi in XII Prophetas*, éd. P.E. Pusey, vol. I-II, Bruxelles, 1965.

[15] *Interpretatio in prophetas minores* (*CPG* III, n° 6558), éd. M. Faulhaber, *Die Prophetenkatenen nach römischen Handschriften*, Freiburg in Breisgau, 1899: introduction générale et édition des scholies à Abdias. Les scholies aux versets examinés d'Amos, de Joël et de Zacharie

et un groupe de *kephalaia* attribués à cet auteur plus tardivement.[16]

Outre ces exégètes qui suivent le texte scripturaire de verset en verset, voire de mot en mot,[17] plusieurs Pères utilisent, souvent en les groupant, deux de nos péricopes,—Am 8, 9 et Za 14, 5-7—, dans des œuvres dont la visée n'est pas d'abord exégétique. Il est particulièrement intéressant de voir ces versets apparaître dans des contextes aussi variés que la préparation au baptême, la correspondance privée ou l'homélie de circonstance. Ainsi, Irénée[18] et Eusèbe[19] utilisent Am 8, 9,—en harmonie avec Jér 15, 9 chez Irénée, en harmonie avec Za 14, 5-7 chez Eusèbe—, dans leur entreprise apologétique: ces prophéties annoncent la Passion du Christ. Origène utilise Za 14, 5-7 en commentant l'Évangile de Matthieu,[20] soit dans une perspective similaire de démonstration du lien entre les deux Testaments. La perception de ce lien est si fondamentale que Cyrille de Jérusalem tient à le faire bien saisir à ses catéchumènes,[21] tandis que l'homélie pseudo-chrysostomienne sur la Pâque de 387 fournit les deux références dans un argumentaire anti-judaïque.[22] Quant à Jean Chrysostome, il aime citer Am 8, 9 comme expression métaphorique de l'extrême tristesse aussi bien aux Antiochiens, qui viennent de se mettre dans une situation des plus critiques en renversant les statues impériales,[23] qu'à sa correspondante Olympias, bouleversée par l'exil de Jean.[24]

---

ont été lues sur la reproduction d'un manuscrit du X^e^s., actuellement à la Bibliothèque Vaticane, le *Chisianus* 45.

[16] *Capita XII prophetarum*, PG 93, 1339-1370.

[17] Les citations de Théodore, de Théodoret et de Cyrille d'Alexandrie sans précision d'œuvres renvoient à leurs commentaires continus.

[18] *Op. cit. supra*, n. 8.

[19] *Demonstratio* VI, 18, 44, éd. I.A. Heikel, GCS 23, Leipzig, 1913, p. 282-283; X, 6, 5, p. 468.

[20] *Matth. Cat.* 554 sur Matth. 27, 45, *Matthäuserklärung Katenenfragmente*, éd. E. Klostermann, GCS 41, 1, Leipzig, 1941, p. 227; 565 sur Matth. 28, 1, p. 233.

[21] *Cat.* XIII, 24-25, éd. W.C. Reischl et J. Rupp, t. II, Hildesheim, 1967, p. 82-84; trad. française J. Bouvet, Paris, 1993, p. 202-203.

[22] *Hom. pseudo-chrysostomienne sur la Pâque de 387* 45-47, éd. J. Floëri et P. Nautin, SC 48, Paris, 1957, p. 154-161.

[23] *De statuis* II, 2, PG 49, 36.

[24] *Lettres à Olympias* X, 2 b-c, éd. A.-M. Malingrey, SC 13bis, Paris, 1968, p. 246-249.

II. *Interprétation des prophéties*[25]

1. *Interprétation théologique: les prophéties lues à la lumière du Nouveau Testament*

La lecture patristique de l'Ancien Testament se fait, on le sait, à la lumière du Nouveau:[26] les Pères cherchent dans le Nouveau Testament des épisodes qui peuvent se lire comme des réalisations de certaines prophéties tandis qu'ils repèrent dans l'Ancien des "types" susceptibles de préfigurer les mystères du Christ. La première de ces démarches concerne particulièrement nos péricopes.

Ainsi, Am 8, 9 et Za 14, 5-7 sont lus par plusieurs Pères comme des annonces du jour de la Passion du Christ. En effet, les récits évangéliques permettent de rendre compte du caractère ambigu de ce jour,[27] que soulignent certains commentateurs.[28]

Les scholies d'Hésychius à Za 14, 5-7,[29] dans leur brièveté, reconstituent la chronologie de ce jour énigmatique:[30]

---

[25] On trouvera en annexe un tableau récapitulatif des différents commentaires. On pourra ainsi repérer facilement les versets qui ne sont interprétés que dans les commentaires continus et ceux qui sont l'objet de commentaires dans d'autres contextes, si l'exégèse est théologique (TH) ou psychologique (PS) et chez quels auteurs.

[26] Voir par ex. G. Dorival, *Sens de l'Écriture*, in *SDB*, XII, 67, 1992, 426-442, en part. 432-433.

[27] C'est sans doute ce qui permet d'expliquer l'absence d'insertion du "jour" d'Am 8, 9 à un contexte eschatologique et la rareté de l'exégèse du "jour" de Za 14, 5-7 comme "seconde parousie" (ἡ δευτέρα παρουσία) (Eusèbe de Césarée, *Dem.* VI, 18, 42-43, GCS 23, p. 282-283) et "jour du jugement" (ἡ τῆς κρίσεως) (Cyrille d'Alexandrie).

[28] Voir *infra*, p. 342, 343 et 345.

[29] F. 72; cf. scholies à Am. 8, 9, f. 32v.; Jl 4, 15, f. 24. Dans une homélie (hom. IX, *In S. Stephanum* 15-16, in: *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, publ. par M. Aubineau, vol. I, Bruxelles, 1978, p. 338-341), Hésychius ajoute à la même interprétation théologique une application psychologique des versets à l'aveuglement des Juifs: "Ces événements sont arrivés littéralement (αἰσθητῶς) et spirituellement (νοητῶς). *Il arrivera en ce jour-là qu'il n'y aura pas de lumière*: le soleil en effet s'est couché au milieu du jour, tandis que l'obscurité et l'ignorance s'étaient répandues dans le cœur des Juifs. *Il y aura du froid et de la glace*: Pierre en témoigne, lui qui se chauffe près du brasier à cause de la température extrême de la saison d'hiver. Mais il y avait du froid et de la glace pour cette autre raison que l'amour des Juifs envers Dieu alors surtout s'était refroidi: sans quoi ils n'auraient pas crucifié celui qui venait d'auprès de lui, en sauveur et en libérateur." Dans la même orientation exégétique, Cyrille d'Alexandrie intègre dans son commentaire d'Am 8, 9 un dossier scripturaire sur l'aveuglement des Juifs (Ps 68, 24: les yeux obscurcis; II Co 3, 15: le voile sur le cœur).

[30] Ce caractère énigmatique a inspiré à Grégoire de Nysse un commentaire spéculatif: il voit dans ce jour innommable le "huitième jour," hors du temps de la première

> *En ce jour-là*: celui de la croix.
> *Il n'y aura pas de lumière*: car *il y eut de l'obscurité à partir de la sixième heure.*[31] (. . .)
> *Ce ne sera ni un jour*: car c'était l'obscurité.
> *Ni une nuit*: car c'était le moment du jour.
> *Et vers le soir, il y aura de la lumière*: puisqu'après la neuvième heure, il fit clair à nouveau.

Les références chronologiques reposent sur les précisions données par les synoptiques qui délimitent la durée de l'obscurité entre la sixième et la neuvième heure.[32] Le début du verset 45 du chapitre 27 de Matthieu constitue même une scholie à lui seul. L'exégète peut ainsi rendre compte des affirmations à première lecture contradictoires du prophète: le jour ne peut être appelé ni jour, parce qu'il comporte de la nuit en plein jour, ni nuit, parce que l'obscurité occupe des heures diurnes et ne s'installe pas définitivement.[33] Selon le même commentateur, la prophétie de Zacharie se reconnaît encore comme telle à travers un autre détail d'ordre atmosphérique:

> *Il y aura froid et gelée pendant un seul jour*: celui de la croix, où Pierre, à cause du froid, se réchauffait près d'un feu de braise.

Cette circonstance est en effet mentionnée dans le récit de trois évangélistes:

> Les serviteurs et les gardes avaient fait un feu de braise à cause du froid et ils étaient là à se chauffer. Pierre aussi se tenait là avec eux et se chauffait.[34]

Implicites dans le genre des scholies, les correspondances avec les récits évangéliques sont formulées par les commentateurs, tel Eusèbe de Césarée:

> Vois s'il ne montre pas par ces mots d'une façon très limpide le jour de la Passion de notre Sauveur, jour où se sont accomplies (ἐπλήρουτο) d'une part la parole (τὸ μέν) *il n'y aura pas de lumière*, quand *à partir de la sixième heure il y eut de l'obscurité sur toute la terre jusqu'à la neuvième heure*,[35] d'autre part la parole

---

création, synonyme du "jour que fit le Seigneur" (Ps 117, 24). Ces expressions désigneraient l'entrée dans l'éternité, l'inauguration d'une création nouvelle où les notions temporelles de jour et de nuit n'ont plus cours (*De tridui spatio*, éd. E. Gebhardt, GNO IX, p. 278-279).

[31] Mt 27, 45.

[32] Mt 27, 45; cf. Mc 15, 33; Lc 23, 44.

[33] Cf. Théodoret, qui résume ainsi son embarras: "Si je décide de l'appeler "jour," l'obscurité à midi m'en empêche; si en revanche je veux le nommer "nuit" à cause de l'obscurité, la lumière qui exista jusqu'à la sixième heure et celle qui exista après la neuvième me l'interdisent."

[34] Jn 18, 18; cf. Mc 14, 67; Lc 22, 55.

[35] Mt 27, 45.

(τὸ δέ) *mais il y aura du froid et de la gelée*, lorsque, selon Luc, après s'être emparés de Jésus, *ils le conduisirent à la maison du grand-prêtre; quant à Pierre, il les suivait de loin; comme ils avaient allumé un feu au milieu de la cour,*[36] *il s'assit*, selon Marc, *avec les autres, et il se chauffait;*[37] Jean, lui aussi, a mentionné sans détours le froid en ces termes: *Se tenaient là les esclaves et les serviteurs qui avaient fait du feu, car il faisait froid, et ils se chauffaient.*[38]

Or *ce jour était connu du Seigneur*, dit-il, *et ce n'était pas un jour, comme ce n'était pas une nuit.* Ce n'était pas un jour (οὐχ ἡμέρα μέν), conformément à la prédiction *il n'y aura pas de lumière*, qui s'accomplissait également (ὃ καὶ ἐπληροῦτο), lorsque *depuis la sixième heure il y eut de l'obscurité sur toute la terre jusqu'à la neuvième heure*; ce n'était pas non plus une nuit (οὐ νὺξ δέ), conformément à la parole ajoutée: *vers le soir, il y aura de la lumière*, ce qui trouvait également sa réalisation (ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ τέλους ἐτύγχανεν), lorsqu'après la neuvième heure de nouveau le jour retrouvait la lumière habituelle.[39]

L'apologiste a soin de passer en revue les différents éléments de la prophétie (τὸ μέν, τὸ δέ, οὐχ ἡμέρα μέν, οὐ νὺξ δέ) pour en souligner l'accomplissement (ἐπλήρουτο, ὃ καὶ ἐπληροῦτο, ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ τέλους ἐτύγχανεν). Non seulement la référence aux évangélistes est explicite, mais trois d'entre eux sont nommés, leur accord étant un gage supplémentaire de la correspondance entre prophétie et évangile.

Quand on passe à l'homélie pseudo-chrysostomienne sur la Pâque de 387, l'apologie du christianisme se teinte d'anti-judaïsme:[40] Am 8, 9 et Za 14, 6-7, ici encore groupés, sont éclairés par Am 8, 10,—"Je changerai vos fêtes en deuil"—, lu comme une prophétie du sort malheureux d'Israël.[41]

---

[36] Lc 22, 55.

[37] Mc 14, 67.

[38] Jn 18, 18.

[39] *Die Demonstratio Euangelica* VI, 18, 44; de même Eusèbe met en lien Am 8, 9 et Mt 27, 45 (*Dem.* X, 6, 5), comme l'avait fait Irénée de Lyon (*Adu. haer.* IV, 33, 12); Origène associe Za 14, 5-7 à Mt 27, 45 (*Matth. Cat.* 554) et à Mt 28, 1 (*Matth. Cat.* 565); Théodoret de Cyr utilise les précisions chronologiques de Mt 27, 45 et la scène où Pierre se chauffe dans la cour pour expliquer Za 14, 5-7; Cyrille d'Alexandrie rapproche de même Am 8, 9 tout comme Jl 3, 4 (2, 31) de Mt 27, 45.

[40] Cet anti-judaïsme se rencontre fréquemment dans les commentaires de ces versets prophétiques, considérés comme des témoins à charge contre les Juifs qui n'auraient pas su y lire l'annonce de la Passion et de leur propre malheur. Ainsi, par ex.: Cyrille de Jérusalem, *Cat.* XIII, 25: "Apporte cette précision aux Juifs incrédules (Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς ἀνηκόοις), ô prophète"; Aphraate le Sage persan, *Exposés* XVII, 10, t. II, éd. M.-J. Pierre, SC 359, Paris, 1989, p. 746. Sur l'obscurcissement du soleil comme signe de l'aveuglement des Juifs, voir *supra*, n. 29.

[41] Cyrille de Jérusalem (*Cat.* XIII, 25) comprend ce deuil comme celui des saintes femmes et des apôtres durant la Pâque où Jésus fut crucifié et non comme la punition des Juifs.

La visée du prédicateur est avant tout liturgique: il veut défendre le comput, basé sur l'équinoxe, que les Pères de Nicée ont édicté, en le justifiant par des raisons théologiques,—contrairement à Jean Chrysostome qui, abordant la même question à la même époque, prône la nécessité d'un consensus ecclésial, quels que soient ses fondements, puisque Dieu se situe hors des temps.[42] Il s'oppose donc aux Quartodécimans,—dont l'usage de célébrer la Pâque le 14 Nisan, jour de la Pâque juive, semble déjà tombé en désuétude—, aux Novatiens,—pour qui la fête doit tomber le dimanche suivant le 14 Nisan, ce qui correspond à l'usage antiochien antérieur au concile de Nicée—, et aux Montanistes,—qui célèbrent également Pâques le dimanche suivant le 14 du mois, mais selon le calendrier asiate et non plus selon le calendrier lunaire—. Quelles que soient les subtilités extrêmes des calculs du comput pascal,[43] ces courants hétérodoxes ont un point commun: ils prennent comme référence la fête juive, et c'est essentiellement contre les Juifs que l'homéliste va diriger ses propos:

> Le soleil devait s'obscurcir depuis la sixième heure jusqu'à la neuvième et détourner ses rayons, comme des yeux, pour ne pas voir le sacrilège (ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ τὸ ἄγος). (. . .) Il est nécessaire de reconnaître que c'est à propos de celui qui souffrait que s'est produite l'obscurité qui a eu lieu *à partir de la sixième heure*, selon le récit de l'Évangile,[44] lors de la Passion du Sauveur. Et l'Écriture l'a proclamé par avance d'une manière prophétique. Amos dit en effet: *Et il arrivera en ce jour-là, dit le Seigneur, que le soleil se couchera à midi et que la lumière s'obscurcira en plein jour.*[45] Comme ce jour devait être partagé entre la lumière et l'obscurité, Zacharie, un autre prophète, dit à son tour: *Il arrivera en ce jour-là qu'il n'y aura pas de lumière (. . .); et ce jour sera connu du Seigneur; ce ne sera ni un jour ni une nuit, et vers le soir, il y aura de la lumière*:[46] il en fait un jour complètement ambigu par la succession alternée de l'obscurité et de la lumière. Puisque le prophète a proclamé que le soleil s'obscurcirait à midi, et puisque parfois certains incrédules devaient douter (ἀπιστεῖν) si cela s'est vraiment produit à propos du Sauveur ou non, il existe, visible maintenant à tes propres

---

[42] *Adu. Iudaeos* III, 6, PG 48, 870-871: "Même si l'Église se trompait, l'avantage qui résulterait de l'observation exacte des temps ne serait pas si grand que l'accusation qui résulterait de cette division et de cette scission. À vrai dire, je ne fais aucun cas du moment, puisque Dieu non plus n'en fait aucun (νυνὶ δὲ οὐδείς μοι περὶ καιροῦ λόγος, ἐπειδὴ οὐδὲ τῷ Θεῷ)." Voir SC 48, introduction de F. Flöeri et P. Nautin, p. 50-77.

[43] Voir H. Leclercq, "Pâques," in *DACL* XIII, 2, 1938, 1521-1558; V. Loi, "Comput ecclésiastique," *DECA* I, 1990, p. 526-528; W. Rordorf, "Pâques," *DECA* II, 1990, p. 1903-1905; F. Flöeri et de P. Nautin, SC 48, introduction, p. 18-42.

[44] Mt 27, 45.

[45] Am 8, 9.

[46] Za 14, 6-7.

yeux (ὑπὸ τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἄρτι ὁρώμενον), une grande preuve (μέγα τεκμήριον), afin que, voyant d'après cette preuve la réalisation de l'oracle (ἐκ τοῦ τεκμηρίου τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν βλέπων), tu n'aies plus de question à te poser (ζητήματος ἀπαλλάττοιο). Quelle est donc aujourd'hui la conséquence (παρακολουθεῖ σήμερον) de la Passion? Pour montrer que la parole du Maître s'adressait aux Juifs comme une menace, Amos dit, en mettant en avant la Passion du Sauveur le *Bien-Aimé* de Dieu, et en regard leur transgression: *Le soleil se couchera à midi et la lumière s'obscurcira en plein jour; je changerai vos fêtes en deuil et tous vos chants en lamentation; je mettrai sur tous les reins le sac et sur toutes les têtes la calvitie; je les placerai, eux, comme le deuil d'un Bien-Aimé et leurs compagnons comme un jour de douleur.*[47] Dieu a posé, en effet, comme signe que le soleil se coucherait en plein midi, le changement de leurs fêtes en deuil et de leurs chants en lamentation, et il a dit qu'il ferait tout cela à cause de son Bien-Aimé. (. . .) Eh bien, vois! Si depuis que le Sauveur a souffert, les souffrances n'en sont pas la conséquence directe (παρακολουθεῖ), si leurs fêtes n'ont pas été changées en deuil ni leurs chants en lamentation, alors non, le soleil ne s'est pas couché à midi. Mais si tu vois ce grand prodige: d'une part le Christ crucifié en la fête de Pâques, et d'autre part, en châtiment de cela, leurs fêtes changées en deuil, quand les Romains ont attaqué, que les Juifs se sont tous réfugiés dans Jérusalem comme dans un commun piège et, durant les fêtes elles-mêmes, au dire de l'histoire (ὡς ἡ ἱστορία φησίν),[48] ont été exterminés par le fer et le feu, la faim et des douleurs infinies, si bien que tant de maux accumulés sur eux ont accompli à la lettre le changement des fêtes en deuil et des chants en lamentations, alors bien évidemment, puisque ces choses sont arrivées à la vue de tous (ὑπ' ὄψεσιν), le soleil de midi s'est couché, car tel est le sens de l'oracle. Il est de fait que pendant une durée de deux ans la guerre consuma les Juifs dans le deuil et a étendu le deuil jusqu'à la Judée d'aujourd'hui. Car où est le temple et où le sacerdoce, où la royauté et où la citadelle, où la ville de la Loi? Tout est ruiné et tout s'est éteint, tout a été complètement détruit et avec le coucher du soleil s'est changé en deuil."[49]

Le prédicateur s'adresse à ceux qui doutent (ἀπιστεῖν) du lien entre le prodige décrit par les prophètes et la Passion du Christ. Il veut fournir une preuve (τεκμήριον, ἐκ τοῦ τεκμηρίου) dont il souligne l'importance (μέγα) et le caractère concret. En effet, il donne une double garantie du lien mis en question (ζητήματος): les malheurs survenus aux Juifs tels qu'ils sont connus par le témoignage historique (ὡς ἡ ἱστορία φησίν), conséquence immédiate des outrages faits à Jésus, et tels qu'ils sont constatables par le regard (ὑπὸ τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἄρτι ὁρώμενον, τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν βλέπων, ὑπ' ὄψεσιν) de

[47] Am 8, 9-10.

[48] Allusion au récit de la Pâque 70 par Flavius Josèphe, *La guerre des Juifs* V, III, 1.

[49] Ps. Chrysostome, *Hom. sur la Pâque de 387*, 45-47, trad. F. Flöeri et de P. Nautin légèrement modifiée, SC 48, p. 154-160.

l'auditeur, conséquence actuelle (παρακολουθεῖ σήμερον) de ces mêmes outrages. Le lien entre la prophétie de l'Ancien Testament,—l'obscurcissement solaire—, et sa réalisation dans le Nouveau, lors de la Passion, sera démontré par la coexistence entre deux autres liens. Le Pseudo-Chrysostome, d'une part, considère comme un acquis indiscutable le lien de cause à effet entre la crucifixion du Christ et les malheurs d'Israël (παρακολουθεῖ). Il souligne d'autre part le lien logique entre deux versets prophétiques: le changement de la fête en deuil du Bien-Aimé,—Am 8, 10—, s'enchaîne à l'obscurcissement solaire,—Am 8, 9. Dans la mesure où le second verset exprime un changement considéré comme indiscutablement relatif à la situation d'Israël et consécutif à la crucifixion, le premier verset ne peut que se référer à leur cause commune: la Passion.

On note encore dans un autre contexte anti-judaïque l'exploitation d'un dossier scripturaire qui inclut Am 8, 9 et Za 14, 6-7 ainsi que Jér 15, 9. Dans les *spuria* de Grégoire de Nysse, figurent des *Testimonia adversus Iudaeos*,[50] dans lesquels l'auteur rassemble des versets de l'Ancien Testament "Sur la croix et sur l'obscurité qui se produisit."[51] Il s'agit de repérer dans les prophéties les différents éléments de la scène de la crucifixion, notamment la position du Christ, les bras tendus[52] et surplombant le monde.[53] Nos péricopes sont utilisées pour annoncer l'obscurité en plein jour et accompagnées de deux versets du Deutéronome qui associent,—du moins dans la compréhension probable du Pseudo-Grégoire, qui cite un texte éloigné de celui des Septante[54]—, l'évocation du supplice à celle du bouleversement des temps: "Vous verrez votre vie suspendue devant vos yeux et vous n'aurez sûrement pas confiance si l'on vous donne une explication. Le matin tu diras: 'Comment le soir est-il venu?' et le soir tu diras: 'Comment le matin est-il venu?'"

Préparant ses catéchumènes à la "grande semaine," Cyrille de Jérusalem groupe lui aussi Am 8, 9 et Za 14, 5-7 pour montrer que les détails météorologiques concernant le jour de la Passion étaient annoncés par les prophètes, signe de la cohérence parfaite entre l'Ancien Testament et le Nouveau:

---

[50] PG 46, 193-233; *CPG* II, n° 3221; voir *supra*, n. 9.

[51] ch. VII, PG 46, 213-216: Περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ γενομένου σκότους.

[52] Is 65, 2: "Tout le jour, j'ai tendu les mains vers un peuple qui me contredit et m'est infidèle."

[53] Is 62, 10: "Élevez un signe pour les nations."

[54] Voir notes aux versets: M. Harl et C. Dogniez, *La Bible d'Alexandrie* 5, Paris, 1992.

Donc le Christ a été crucifié pour nous, lui qu'on a jugé de nuit, tandis qu'il faisait froid et qu'on avait en conséquence allumé un feu de charbons. Il a été crucifié à la troisième heure; mais à partir de la sixième heure, l'obscurité se produisit jusqu'à la neuvième heure; puis à partir de la neuvième heure, la lumière revint.[55] Est-ce que ces circonstances sont dans les Écritures? Cherchons (ζητήσωμεν). Zacharie dit donc: *En ce jour-là, il arrivera qu'il n'y aura pas de lumière; il y aura froid et gelée pendant un seul jour*—le froid à cause duquel Pierre se chauffait—; *ce jour est connu du Seigneur.* Quoi donc, ne connaît-il pas les autres? Nombreux sont les jours, mais *ce jour* de la Passion du Seigneur *est celui que fit le Seigneur*[56] et ce jour est bien connu du Seigneur; *et ce ne sera ni un jour ni une nuit.* Quelle énigme dit ici le prophète? Ce jour n'est ni un jour ni une nuit? Quel nom lui donnerons-nous? L'Évangile l'explique (ἑρμηνεύει) en racontant ce qui se passe. Ce n'était pas le jour car le soleil ne brilla pas du levant au ponant comme d'habitude, mais de la sixième à la neuvième heure, l'obscurité se fit en plein milieu du jour. L'obscurité donc s'interposa: *Et Dieu nomma l'obscurité "nuit."*[57] C'est pourquoi ce n'était ni le jour ni la nuit. Car ce n'était pas la pleine lumière pour qu'on donnât le nom de jour, ni l'obscurité complète pour qu'on donnât le nom de nuit; mais après la neuvième heure, le soleil brilla. Le prophète l'annonce aussi, car après avoir dit: *et ce ne sera ni un jour ni une nuit,* il a ajouté: *et vers le soir, il y aura de la lumière.*[58] Tu vois la précision des prophètes? Tu vois la vérité des événements annoncés par l'Écriture?

Mais tu cherches (ζητεῖς) à quelle heure exactement le soleil s'est éclipsé? Est-ce à la cinquième heure ou à la huitième ou à la dixième? (. . .) Le prophète Amos dit: *Et il arrivera en ce jour-là, dit le Seigneur Dieu, que le soleil se couchera à midi—depuis la sixième heure* en effet, *il y eut de l'obscurité*[59]*—et que la lumière s'obscurcira sur la terre en plein jour*[60]*."*[61]

Après avoir associé ses auditeurs à une recherche dans les Écritures (ζητήσωμεν), c'est l'Évangile qu'il présente comme clef exégétique[62] de la prophétie de Zacharie: "Quelle énigme (αἴνιγμα) dit ici le prophète? (. . .) L'Évangile l'explique (ἑρμηνεύει)." Et à deux reprises, des incises explicatives

---

[55] Cyrille résume ici les détails des récits évangéliques (références *supra*, n. 34-35).

[56] Ps 117, 24: on note la même harmonisation scripturaire que chez Grégoire de Nysse, mais avec une interprétation totalement différente (voir *supra*, n. 30).

[57] Gn 1, 5.

[58] Za 14, 5-7.

[59] Mt 27, 45.

[60] Am 8, 9.

[61] Cyrille de Jérusalem, *Cat.* XIII, 24-25, trad. J. Bouvet légèrement modifiée.

[62] Hésychius de Jérusalem, dans son homélie *In s. Stephanum* (voir *supra*, n. 29), adopte la même démarche, comme le souligne M. Aubineau: "C'est le Christ, et plus particulièrement sa Passion, qui donnent la clef des prédictions de Za 14, 6-8" (*Les homélies festales* . . . vol. I, p. 300).

insèrent les données évangéliques à l'intérieur de la prophétie: la mention du froid dont souffrit Pierre s'intègre dans le verset de Zacharie tandis qu'un verset de Matthieu est intercalé à l'intérieur d'un verset d'Amos. Le va-et-vient est constant entre les deux Testaments, non seulement entre les prophéties et les Évangiles, mais en une harmonie plus large avec le livre fondateur, la Genèse, et le Psautier, dans lequel les Juifs, le Christ lui-même et les chrétiens puisent leur prière. Ainsi se crée une très forte impression de cohérence.

On note chez Cyrille de Jérusalem comme chez plusieurs autres Pères une double attitude face à ces prophéties. L'auditeur ou le lecteur doit prendre conscience de leur caractère ardu: elles annoncent une "énigme" (αἴνιγμα),[63] "un jour complètement ambigu" (ὅλην ἀμφίβολον).[64] Mais c'est pour qu'il apprécie d'autant plus la méthode herméneutique permettant de les élucider: la lecture des Évangiles donne en effet de saisir "la précision des prophètes" (προφητῶν ἀκρίβειαν);[65] déjà Irénée lit une annonce "manifeste" (φανερῶς) de la Passion chez Amos, et plus encore (φανερώτερον) chez Jérémie;[66] quant à Eusèbe de Césarée, il peut écrire: "Vois s'il ne montre pas par ces mots d'une façon très limpide (λευκότατα) le jour de la Passion de notre Sauveur."[67] Autrement dit, ils mettent en valeur l'extrême difficulté des textes pour que soit plus frappante encore la réussite de l'entreprise herméneutique: le Nouveau Testament permet d'éclairer jusque dans le détail des versets prophétiques dont le sens global est loin de s'imposer.

2. *Interprétation psychologique: les prophéties lues au sens figuré*

Plusieurs Pères se sont interrogés sur la littéralité des prodiges suscités par le Seigneur au jour de sa colère: s'agit-il de phénomènes cosmiques ou de perturbations psychiques déformant la perception? On découvre un mélange d'audace et de prudence chez les commentateurs.

Théodore n'hésite pas à écrire:

---

[63] Cyrille de Jérusalem, *Cat.* XIII, 24.

[64] Ps. Chrysostome, *Hom. sur la Pâque de 387*, 45.

[65] Cyrille de Jérusalem, *Cat.* XIII, 24 et 25.

[66] *Adu. haereses* IV, 33, 12.

[67] *Dem.* VI, 18, 44; cf. X, 6, 5: la Passion constitue "l'accomplissement évident" (ἐναργῆ τὴν ἔκβασιν) d'Am 8, 9; Théodoret insiste sur les garanties que le Nouveau Testament donne à la vérité des prophéties: "l'enseignement des faits historiques" (ἡ ἱστορία ἐδίδαξεν), le "témoignage universel" (ἵνα πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῇ τῆς προφητείας μαρτυρήσωσιν ἀληθείᾳ), et plus particulièrement celui qu'apportent les évangélistes et le "coryphée des apôtres," Pierre (οἱ εὐαγγελισταὶ μάρτυρες καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ κορυφαῖος).

Le prophète semble parler la plupart du temps (τὰ πολλά) hyperboliquement (ὑπερβολικῶς), pour frapper davantage ses auditeurs (εἰς μείζονα ἔκπληξιν τῶν ἀκουόντων), dans la mesure où, quelles que puissent bien être ses paroles, elles sont inférieures aux actions (de Dieu). Mais il est clair (δῆλος) qu'ici encore (κάνταῦθα) il ne dit pas que les éléments sont confondus et transformés (οὐ τὰ στοιχεῖα λέγων . . . συγχεῖσθαι καὶ μετατίθεσθαι): comme c'est le propre (ἴδιον) de ceux qui sont éprouvés par les malheurs (τοῖς ἐν κακοῖς ἐξεταζομένοις), souvent (πολλάκις) leurs représentations (τὰς ὑπολήψεις . . . μεθίστασθαι) se transforment en fonction de la contrainte (ἀνάγκην) qui les tient. Donc, il ne dit pas qu'à sa venue les éléments terrestres sont remplis de confusion mais que ceux qui subissent de son fait de telles souffrances (τοιαῦτα πάσχουσι) sur la terre ont l'impression (δοκεῖ) à la fois que le ciel est ébranlé et que le soleil, la lune et les étoiles ne brillent plus, car le poids des malheurs (τῆς τῶν κακῶν βαρύτητος) ôte à ceux qui les subissent la perception (τὴν αἴσθησιν) de la lumière.[68]

Le soleil se changera en obscurité et la lune en sang, selon l'illusion (ὑπόνοιαν) dont seront victimes (ὑπομενοῦσιν) les spectateurs, à cause de la grandeur des malheurs (κακῶν) qui les assailliront.[69]

Il ne parle pas de la lumière, du froid et de la gelée réels (οὐ . . . ὄντως . . . λέγει): comme il a l'habitude (εἴωθε) de dire que le soleil s'obscurcira et se couchera pour eux,—et de nombreux autres faits du même ordre (καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα)—, dans la pensée que ceux qui sont dans le malheur (τῶν ἐν συμφοραῖς ὄντων) n'ont aucune perception (αἴσθησιν) de la lumière mais ont alors l'impression (δοκούντων) d'être comme (ὥσπερ) dans une sorte d'obscurité (ἐν σκότῳ τινί), ainsi parle-t-il encore ici (κάνταῦθα)."[70]

De même, Cyrille d'Alexandrie met ni plus ni moins en doute la réalité concrète du prodige annoncé:

Le soleil et la lune s'obscurciront, dit-il, et *les étoiles elles-mêmes seront dépourvues de clarté*. Non qu'il parle absolument (οὐχὶ δὴ πάντως), dans la pensée que les éléments subiront (τῶν στοιχείων πεισομένων) alors cela même, mais dans la pensée que la guerre engendre une obscurité et qu'elle répand sur les regards des vaincus comme (οἷον) un brouillard. Car la crainte de la mort obscurcit toujours (ἀεί), et la grandeur d'un malheur imprévu (συμφορᾶς ἀδοκήτου μέγεθος) émousse l'esprit (νοῦν) et assombrit le cœur (καρδίαν) par l'excès des souffrances comme (ὥσπερ) par des ténèbres.[71]

Une profonde obscurité se répandra, puisque le soleil de quelque manière (τρόπον τινά) se couchera, et cela à midi. Sans doute ne prétendons-nous pas

---

[68] Sur Jl 2, 10.
[69] Sur Jl 3, 4 (2, 31).
[70] Sur Za 14, 6.
[71] Sur Jl 4 (3), 14.

> que la lumière du soleil s'est véritablement (οὐ . . . κατὰ τὸ ἀληθές) cachée: le malheur provoqué par la guerre a été comme (ὡς) une obscurité pour les habitants de la Samarie. Car lorsque surgit une affliction d'une ampleur et d'une grandeur démesurées (πολλὴ καὶ ὑπερμεγέθης . . . λύπη), elle trouble complètement l'esprit (νοῦν), les événements qui surviennent contre toute attente et toute prévision (τὰ παρ' ἐλπίδα τε καὶ ἀδοκήτως συμβαίνοντα) obscurcissent le cœur (καρδίαν) et l'amertume des chagrins (τῶν σκυθρωπῶν ἡ δριμύτης) crée dans les coeurs de ceux qui les éprouvent (ταῖς τῶν παθόντων καρδίαις) comme (οἱά τινα) une nappe de brouillard."[72]

En revanche, Théodoret introduit des propos semblables avec une grande circonspection. En effet, il souligne bien que le sens figuré n'exclut pas nécessairement le sens littéral de la prophétie, et il mentionne les éclipses constatables:

> Alors, ceux qui sont saisis par les malheurs (συμφορῶν) auront l'impression (δόξει) que le soleil se transforme en obscurité au milieu du jour.[73]

> *Le soleil et la lune s'obscurciront et les astres ne donneront pas leur éclat.* (. . .) Ces paroles, il est vraisemblable (εἰκός) qu'elles se soient réalisées dans les faits mêmes (δι' αὐτῶν . . . τῶν πραγμάτων): (. . .) nous avons vu souvent se produire des éclipses de soleil et de lune, et il y a des cas où, du fait de la sécheresse, les astres deviennent tout à fait indistincts. (. . .) Mais il est possible de concevoir aussi les choses autrement (ἑτέρως νοῆσαι). En effet, ceux qui sont dans le malheur (συμφόραις), qui vivent comme (οἷον) dans une sorte d'obscurité (ἐν σκότῳ τινί) ne perçoivent (ἐπαισθάνονται) pas l'état des cieux, ne se représentent pas (ὑπολαμβάνουσιν) que la terre est immobile, ni que le jour baigne dans la lumière, ni que la nuit baigne dans une clarté qui lui correspond: ils estiment (νομίζουσι) que tout est bouleversé de fond en comble.[74]

> Il dit encore que le soleil, la lune et le reste des étoiles seront privés de lumière. Et il est vraisemblable que les choses se soient réellement produites ainsi (εἰκός . . . τῷ ὄντι), le dieu de l'ensemble des éléments ayant mu contre eux (= les ennemis d'Israël) toute la création. Toutefois, il est possible de concevoir aussi les choses autrement (ἑτέρως νοῆσαι). Car pour ceux qui ont quitté la vie et ont été livrés à la mort, ni le soleil ni la lune ni aucune des étoiles n'émet l'éclat de sa lumière. Or ceux qui étaient saisis par des malheurs inattendus (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδοκήτων . . . κακῶν) vivaient dans l'obscurité, parce qu'ils prenaient (νομίζοντες) le jour pour la nuit.[75]

La réalité concrète des prodiges se trouve niée ou considérée comme une interprétation envisageable mais d'intérêt second. La négation de ce carac-

---

[72] Sur Am 8, 9.
[73] Sur Am 8, 9.
[74] Sur Jl 2, 10.
[75] Sur Jl 4 (3), 14.

tère concret est très nette chez Théodore,—"il ne dit pas que les éléments sont confondus et transformés (οὐ τὰ στοιχεῖα λέγων . . . συγχεῖσθαι καὶ μετατίθεσθαι)"; "il ne parle pas de la lumière, du froid et de la gelée réels (οὐ . . . ὄντως . . . λέγει)"—, et chez Cyrille,—"non qu'il parle absolument (οὐχὶ δὴ πάντως), dans la pensée que les éléments subiront (τῶν στοιχείων πεισομένων) alors cela même"; "sans doute ne prétendons-nous pas que la lumière du soleil s'est véritablement (οὐ . . . κατὰ τὸ ἀληθές) cachée." L'obscurcissement solaire en plein midi devient un terme de comparaison,[76] une approximation.[77] Mais alors, si, comme l'affirme Théodore, le plus péremptoire des trois exégètes,[78] le prophète parle "hyperboliquement (ὑπερβολικῶς), pour frapper davantage ses auditeurs (εἰς μείζονα ἔκπληξιν τῶν ἀκουόντων)," quel crédit peut-on lui accorder, et que penser de l'action de Dieu? L'évêque de Mopsueste précise immédiatement le sens de son affirmation: "Quelles que puissent bien être ses paroles, elles sont inférieures aux actions (de Dieu)." L'intervention de Dieu dépasse toute représentation, et s'il faut recourir à l'évocation de phénomènes cosmiques, c'est pour suggérer une action psychique, intérieure à l'homme, encore plus prodigieuse. Cette action, elle s'exerce non sur "les éléments" (τὰ στοιχεῖα),[79] mais sur l'univers mental de l'homme, dont Cyrille désigne la complexité à la fois par le "cœur" (καρδία) et par l'"esprit" (νοῦς). Elle modifie, selon Théodore et Théodoret, les "représentations" (ὑπολήψεις - ὑπολαμβάνουσιν), la "perception" (αἴσθησις - ἐπαισθάνονται), l'"impression" (δοκεῖν - δόξει), ou, selon Théodore, donne une perception illusoire (ὑπόνοιαν) de la réalité, ou encore, selon Théodoret, perturbe l'évaluation du réel (νομίζουσι - νομίζοντες). Dieu travaille ainsi à l'intérieur de l'homme, à travers les processus psychiques déclenchés par la souffrance. Il s'agit en effet du comportement que Théodore considère comme "typique" (ἴδιον) de l'homme malheureux. Cyrille et Théodoret mettent en valeur une caractéristique de ce malheur: il bouleverse d'autant plus l'équilibre de l'homme sur lequel il s'abat qu'il est inattendu.[80]

---

[76] Théodore: ὥσπερ - Théodoret: οἷον - Cyrille: ὡς - ὥσπερ - οἷον.

[77] Théodore: τινί - Théodoret: τινί - Cyrille: τρόπον τινά - οἷά τινα.

[78] "Mais il est clair (δῆλος) qu' . . . il ne dit pas . . ."

[79] Théodore: "il ne dit pas que les éléments sont confondus et transformés (οὐ τὰ στοιχεῖα λέγων . . . συγχεῖσθαι καὶ μετατίθεσθαι)"; Cyrille: "*Le soleil et la lune s'obscurciront*, dit-il, et *les étoiles elles-mêmes seront dépourvues de clarté.* Non qu'il parle absolument (οὐχὶ δὴ πάντως), dans la pensée que les éléments subiront (τῶν στοιχείων πεισομένων) alors cela même."

[80] Cyrille: "la grandeur d'un malheur imprévu (συμφορᾶς ἀδοκήτου μέγεθος)"; "les événements qui surviennent contre toute attente et toute prévision (τὰ παρ' ἐλπίδα τε

Théodore remarque avec une grande finesse psychologique[81] combien l'homme qui a atteint ce degré de souffrance perd toute maîtrise de son propre psychisme: il subit une "contrainte" (πρὸς ἀνάγκην) qui lui donne une perception subjective de l'obscurité alors qu'objectivement, il est inondé de soleil. Théodore donne à cette interprétation une valeur généralisante: il s'agit là d'un procédé usuel (εἴωθε) chez les prophètes et le verset envisagé n'en est qu'un exemple (κἀνταῦθα). Cette exégèse pourrait s'appliquer à "de nombreux autres faits du même ordre" (καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα). Ainsi, la description de bouleversements cosmiques des plus spectaculaires traduirait des bouleversements psychiques dont le caractère redoutable risque de passer totalement inaperçu auprès de ceux qui ne les vivent pas.

La mise en perspective du prodige annoncé par les prophètes avec la Passion du Christ décrite par les Évangélistes est l'une des utilisations possibles de ces versets dans le discours pastoral, comme le montre, par exemple, une catéchèse de Cyrille de Jérusalem.[82] Une autre manière de faire saisir ces textes obscurs est de les actualiser. C'est une exégèse de type psychologique, telle que l'on vient de la découvrir dans les commentaires continus, qui permet à Jean Chrysostome de citer ces versets comme l'expression d'une détresse extrême, communautaire ou individuelle.

En 387, lorsque les Antiochiens ont renversé les statues impériales et redoutent la réaction de Théodose, le prédicateur trouve en Am 8, 9 l'expression de ce vacillement intérieur qui rend la ville méconnaissable:[83]

> J'ai l'impression (μοι δοκεῖ) que la nature même de l'air tout comme le cercle même des rayons solaires s'assombrissent et paraissent plus obscurs: ce ne sont pas les éléments qui changent de nature (οὐ τῶν στοιχείων τὴν φύσιν) mais nos yeux qui, troublés par le nuage de la tristesse (ἀθυμίας), ne peuvent pas recevoir des rayons la lumière dans sa pureté ni avec la même disposition. C'est ce qu'autrefois le prophète déplorait par ces paroles: *Le soleil se couchera pour eux à midi, et le jour s'obscurcira.* Il parlait ainsi, non dans la pensée que

---

καὶ ἀδοκήτως συμβαίνοντα)"; Théodoret: "ceux qui sont saisis par des malheurs inattendus (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδοκήτων . . . κακῶν)." Olympiodore commente de même Jér 15, 9 (*Fragmenta in Ieremiam*, PG 93, 661): "Saisis par des malheurs soudains (ἀφνιδίως), ils ne voient même plus le soleil sous l'effet de leur trouble."

[81] On peut penser à certains récits cliniques présentés par le neurologue O. Sacks, notamment dans *L'Homme qui prenait sa femme pour un chapeau*, trad. française É. de la Héronnière, Paris, 1992 (1re éd. anglaise, Duckworth, 1985; 1re éd. française, Seuil, 1988).

[82] Voir *supra*, p. 345.

[83] Sur ces événements et sur le processus de l'actualisation dans les homélies prononcées en ces circonstances, voir: L. Brottier, *L'actualisation de la figure de Job chez Jean Chrysostome*, in *Cahiers de Biblia Patristica* 5 (1996) p. 63-110, en part. p. 92-95.

> l'astre se cache ni que le jour disparaisse, mais dans la pensée que les êtres en proie à la tristesse ne peuvent pas, même à midi, voir la lumière, à cause des ténèbres qui viennent de leur douleur (ὀδύνης). C'est bien ce qui se passe encore maintenant (ὃ δὴ καὶ νῦν γέγονε). Où que l'on regarde, soit en direction du sol, soit en direction des murs, soit en direction des colonnes de la ville, soit en direction de ses voisins, on a l'impression (δοκεῖ) de voir une nuit et des ténèbres profondes, tellement tout est rempli d'un grand découragement (κατηφείας).[84]

On retrouve l'interprétation du phénomène non par la modification des éléments (οὐ τῶν στοιχείων τὴν φύσιν), mais par la perturbation des impressions (δοκεῖ). Le verset s'intègre donc, par le biais d'une exégèse psychologique, à l'actualité la plus immédiate de l'auditoire. La charge émotionnelle dont il est investi en transforme la lecture. Une parole énigmatique, à la rigueur applicable à la Passion,—événement majeur certes, mais bien lointain et peut-être tout aussi énigmatique pour la majorité de l'auditoire—, devient une parole efficace, qui donne forme à l'angoisse vécue (ὃ δὴ καὶ νῦν γέγονε). Exprimée par le prophète, cette angoisse se trouve à la fois agrandie aux dimensions du Livre et atténuée, puisqu'elle n'est plus unique en son genre.

Si le verset d'Amos vient à la bouche de Jean Chrysostome au début de sa vie sacerdotale, c'est encore lui qu'il écrit à sa correspondante de prédilection, Olympias, sur la route de l'exil. Il lui sert à évoquer une des notions les plus fortes de sa spiritualité, l'ἀθυμία, "tristesse" ou "découragement," terme souvent proche de ce que l'on entend aujourd'hui par "dépression"[85] et déjà présent dans la seconde homélie *Sur les Statues*:

> En effet la tristesse (ἀθυμία) est pour les âmes une redoutable chambre de torture, une douleur indicible, une peine plus amère que toute peine et que tout châtiment. Elle imite le ver porteur de poison, s'attaquant non seulement à la chair, mais encore à l'âme elle-même; elle n'est pas seulement le rongeur des os, mais de la pensée (διανοίας), un bourreau continuel, qui ne déchire pas les flancs, mais qui ruine la force de l'âme (δύναμιν ψυχῆς), une nuit ininterrompue, une obscurité sans lueur, une tempête, une agitation, un feu secret, brûlant plus fort que toute flamme, une guerre qui n'a pas de trêve, une maladie qui répand l'ombre sur la plupart des choses visibles. Car le soleil, l'air limpide semblent (δοκεῖ) pour ceux qui sont dans ces dispositions une cause de trouble, et en plein midi font l'effet d'une nuit profonde.

---

[84] *De statuis* II, 2, PG 49, 36.

[85] Sur ce terme, voir: M.-A. Bardolle, "Tristesse (*athumia*) et thérapeutique spirituelle dans l'*Exhortation à Stagire* de Jean Chrysostome," in *Lettre de Ligugé*, 241 (1987, 3) p. 6-19; A.-M. Malingrey, introduction aux *Lettres à Olympias*, SC 13bis, Paris, 1968, en part., p. 47-49.

> Aussi l'admirable Prophète disait-il pour le prouver: *Le soleil se couchera pour eux en plein midi*, non que cet astre disparaisse ou interrompe sa course habituelle, mais parce que l'âme attristée (ἀθυμούσης) croit voir (φανταζομένης) la nuit dans l'instant le plus brillant du jour. En effet, l'ombre de la nuit (τῆς νυκτὸς τὸ σκότος) n'est pas comparable à la nuit de la tristesse (τῆς ἀθυμίας ἡ νύξ) qui ne survient pas selon l'ordre de la nature (νόμον φύσεως), mais est produite par l'obscurcissement des pensées (λογισμῶν), car elle est redoutable et intolérable; elle a un visage sans douceur, elle est plus cruelle que n'importe quel tyran, elle ne cède facilement à aucun de ceux qui veulent la détruire, mais souvent elle retient l'âme qu'elle saisit plus fortement que l'acier (ἀδάμαντος στερρότερον κατέχουσα πολλάκις τὴν ἁλοῦσαν ψυχήν), lorsque cette âme n'est pas imprégnée de sagesse.[86]

On retrouve encore plus nettement formulée l'opposition entre les phénomènes soumis à l'"ordre de la nature" (νόμον φύσεως) et ceux qui concernent la "pensée" (διανοίας), la "force de l'âme" (δύναμιν ψυχῆς), les "pensées" (λογισμῶν). Les premiers servent de termes de comparaisons, mais ne connaissent qu'à un moindre degré le trouble qui peut affecter le monde intérieur: "L'obscurité de la nuit (τῆς νυκτὸς τὸ σκότος) n'est pas comparable (οὐ τοιοῦτο . . . οἵα) à la nuit de la tristesse (τῆς ἀθυμίας ἡ νύξ) qui ne survient pas selon l'ordre de la nature (νόμον φύσεως), mais est produite par l'obscurcissement des pensées (λογισμῶν)." Les impressions (δοκεῖ) de l'âme attristée sont modifiées au point d'être changées en leurs contraires: "L'âme attristée (ἀθυμούσης) croit voir (φανταζομένης) la nuit dans l'instant le plus brillant du jour." Tout comme Théodore,[87] Jean Chrysostome a bien senti cette aliénation de l'âme en proie à un processus destructeur: l'*athumia* "retient souvent l'âme qu'elle saisit plus fortement que l'acier (ἀδάμαντος στερρότερον κατέχουσα πολλάκις τὴν ἁλοῦσαν ψυχήν)." Ces remarques de Jean Chrysostome sur Am 8, 9 s'insèrent dans une réflexion plus générale du prédicateur, d'une part sur le langage figuré de l'Écriture,[88] d'autre part sur la relativité des perceptions et sur leur dépendance par rapport à l'état mental de l'homme.[89]

---

[86] *Lettres à Olympias*, X, 2 b-c, éd. A.-M. Malingrey, SC 13bis, Paris, 1968, p. 246-249.

[87] Voir *supra*, p. 347 (ἀνάγκην).

[88] Cf. par ex. *De gloria in tribulationibus* 2, PG 51, 159: "Les montagnes et les collines n'ont pas bondi. (. . .) Ces éléments n'ont pas d'émotions." Sur cette condescendance (συγκατάβασις) scripturaire, particulièrement soulignée dans les *Interprétations des psaumes*, voir: B. de Margerie, "Saint Jean Chrysostome, docteur de la condescendance biblique," in: *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse, 1. Les Pères grecs et orientaux*, Paris, 1980, ch. VIII, p. 214-239.

[89] Le mauvais riche (*In Ps.* X, 3, PG 55, 143) ou Eutrope (*In Eutropium* 2, PG 52,

Au terme de ce parcours à travers les textes patristiques, quelques conclusions s'imposent, semble-t-il, à propos de ces versets prophétiques prédisant l'obscurcissement solaire en plein jour. Si l'on met de côté Jér 15, 9 pour les raisons indiquées au commencement de cette étude,[90] on se trouve devant quatre péricopes: une en Amos, deux en Joël,—dont l'une est répétée à deux reprises—, une en Zacharie. Si les quatre passages ont été prétextes à des exégèses théologiques ou psychologiques, deux seulement ont véritablement vécu dans la spiritualité des communautés. En effet, les versets de Joël sont certainement peu apparus en dehors des commentaires continus,—on n'en a rencontré aucun exemple au fil de l'examen d'un assez grand nombre de textes. En revanche, Am 8, 9 et Za 14, 5-7 se rencontrent aussi bien dans la polémique que dans la catéchèse, aussi bien dans l'homilétique que dans la correspondance. Ces prophéties s'intègrent à la pastorale soit par la lumière théologique que leur donne le Nouveau Testament, soit par une actualisation fondée sur la psychologie.

Néanmoins, il ne faudrait pas sous-estimer la pratique du commentaire continu, car les réflexions des Antiochiens comme de Cyrille d'Alexandrie et celles de Jean Chrysostome sur la prophétie d'Amos relèvent d'une même tendance exégétique, qui cherche dans les textes les plus énigmatiques de l'Ancien Testament une expression de la détresse humaine, ressentie comme non moins énigmatique.

---

393) connaissent la ténèbre en plein midi. Si le voluptueux change le jour en nuit, celui qui s'adonne à la prière transforme la nuit en jour (*Hom. dicta postquam reliquiae martyrum* 2, PG 63, 470). Le prédicateur oscille entre deux directions: soit, comme dans les exemples précédents, le phénomène est dû à une déformation de la perception, soit, comme dans les passages suivants, Jean insiste davantage sur le changement du cours naturel des choses, mais en fonction de destinataires particuliers, cette précision rapprochant finalement les deux types d'explications. Afin de rendre compte de l'obscurité lumineuse comme le jour du Ps 138 (139), 12, Jean prend l'exemple de la fournaise devenue rosée pour les trois Hébreux (Dan 3) ou de la ténèbre ressentie comme telle par les Égyptiens tandis que les Israélites perçoivent la lumière (Ex 10) (*In Ps.* CXXXVIII, 3, PG 55, 415). Ces prodiges, que Jean considère fréquemment comme déterminés par l'état intérieur des êtres, apparaissent aussi parfois comme des enseignements sur la toute-puissance de Dieu, à un moment où l'homme ne pouvait pas entendre d'autre langage: "Il obscurcit le soleil et provoque son éclipse, proclamant par là son pouvoir créateur. C'est ainsi que tu vois dans les Écritures le soleil reculer, la lune s'arrêter à son tour en même temps que lui, et beaucoup d'autres prodiges. Ces prodiges avaient lieu lorsque la connaissance de Dieu ne s'était pas encore répandue; aujourd'hui en revanche, cet enseignement n'est plus nécessaire" (*In Ps.* CXLII, 5, PG 55, 454).

[90] Voir *supra*, p. 340.

Annexe

Vue d'ensemble des différents commentaires

TH = interprétation théologique
PS = interprétation psychologique

Versets	Commentaires continus	Autres contextes
Am 8, 9	Hésychius (TH) Cyrille d'Alexandrie (TH et PS) Théodoret de Cyr (PS)	Irénée (TH) Eusèbe (TH) Cyrille de Jérusalem (TH) Ps. Chrysostome (TH) Jean Chrysostome (PS)
Jl 2, 10; 4 (3), 15	Hésychius (TH) Théodore de Mopsueste (PS) Cyrille d'Alexandrie (PS) Théodoret de Cyr (PS)	
Jl 3, 4 (2, 31)	Théodore de Mopsueste (PS) Cyrille d'Alexandrie (TH)	
Za 14, 5-7	Hésychius (TH) Théodore de Mopsueste (PS) Théodoret de Cyr (TH)	Origène (TH) Eusèbe (TH) Cyrille de Jérusalem (TH) Hésychius (TH) Ps. Chrysostome (TH)

Université de Poitiers

GNOSTIC LIBERATION FROM ASTROLOGICAL DETERMINISM: HIPPARCHAN "TREPIDATION" AND THE BREAKING OF FATE

BY

HORACE JEFFERY HODGES

Introduction

Of all the intellectual systems of late antiquity, whether religious, philosophical, or some combination thereof, perhaps the one constructed by the Gnostics presented the most radically innovative view of things, for it quite literally demonized the cosmos. Being neither the embodiment of the Stoics' rational, all-pervading "logos," nor the result of the well-intentioned, Platonic demiurge's desire to emulate the ideal forms, nor an expression of the Old Testament god's glory and wisdom, the cosmos, instead, stemmed entirely from evil. All other ancient views, as Hans Blumenberg has demonstrated, preserve at least a residue of trust in the cosmos.[1] Consequently, Gnostics pursued their radical critique of the cosmos further than any other group, finding in the seemingly *regular*, predictable motions of the heavens only the expression of a malevolent plot designed to deceive and entrap them. This perspective thus predisposed them to view celestial *irregularity* as signifying the possibility of a higher, more benevolent force, for such might suggest evidence of an extra-cosmic intervention in the world by a more powerful god of salvation. This article will argue that at least some Gnostics used Hipparchus's discovery of the precession of the equinoxes as evidence for such an intervention in the world by the soteriological god, a miraculous intervention that successfully shifted the zodiacal sphere to break the bonds of astrological fate and release the Gnostic elect from the power of the cosmos and its creator.

[1] H. Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age* (Cambridge, 1983), 269-277.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

Astrological Determinism

Synchronically analyzed in purely systemic terms, Gnosticism's antagonism toward the cosmos sprang directly from its rigorous dualism. Regarding matter as the principle of evil, and spirit alone as the expression of the good, Gnostics hypothesized two gods—the soteriological god of spirit and the material god of creation. Originally, only the spiritual god existed, but for reasons fundamentally inexplicable, though the Gnostics attempted various explanations, he emanated a series of spiritual beings similar to but lesser than himself. Unfortunately, the lowest of these beings, a feminine principle identified in many Gnostic myths as "Sophia," fell from the spiritual realm into the void, accidentally producing both matter and the lower, cosmic god, who took this matter and shaped it into a cosmos. Moreover, Sophia lost part of her spiritual substance in falling, and the lower god managed to trap this lost power within material human bodies of his own creation, intending it to serve *his* purposes. To ensure human subservience, he assigned seven subordinate entities (also of his own making but prior to his creation of humans) to the seven planets of antiquity, placing them (though he sometimes included himself as one of the seven) collectively in charge of "fate," by which force, he inexorably bound humanity to his material realm.

Not only the Gnostics concerned themselves with planetary fate, of course; they merely drew from an already widely accepted tradition in late antiquity, for fatalistic attitudes had spread throughout the Mediterranean by Roman times.[2] Ancient peoples had doubtless long found impressive the apparent correlations between celestial and earthly patterns—the changing position of the sun in the sky and the sequence of the seasons being the most obvious, as the second-century-C.E. astronomer Claudius Ptolemy himself informs us in his astrological work, the *Tetrabiblos*.[3] But those earlier beliefs in the influence of the heavens had probably never taken on an all-encompassing or completely deterministic nature. *Truly* fatalistic attitudes seem to have had their origin in Mesopotamia sometime after 650

---

[2] Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans* (New York and London, 1912), 154; Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (Philadelphia, 1954), 3-44; Wilhelm Gundel und Hans Georg Gundel, *Astrologumena: Die Astrologische Literatur in der Antike und Ihre Geschichte* (Franz Steiner Verlag, GMBH, Wiesbaden, 1966).

[3] Claudius Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos*, I, 2, ed. and trans. by F.E. Robbins, Loeb Classical Library (Harvard University Press, 1964), 8-11.

B.C.E., when the Babylonians had begun keeping daily records of observed celestial events, and sometime before Alexander the Great's eastern conquests, by which time, the Babylonian astral priests had developed *totally* deterministic views.[4]

That such attitudes soon pervaded the incipient Hellenistic world, one can infer from the enormous impact Babylonian astronomy itself had upon Greek natural philosophy, for about 270 B.C.E., the Babylonian priest Berossus moved to the Greek island of Cos, about 75 miles northwest of Rhodes, probably transmitting much Babylonian *empirical* and *arithmetical* tradition and thereby greatly enriching the already-existing Greek *geometrical* approach to astronomy.[5] The records do show, for instance, that Berossus dedicated a work containing astrological doctrine to King Antiochus I (324-261 B.C.E.), the second ruler of the Seleucid empire.[6] Moreover, by the mid-second century B.C.E., if one accepts the reports, Hipparchus, the great theoretical astronomer based upon the important island of Rhodes, did more than merely dabble in astrology, for many ancient sources refer to him as both "astronomer" *and* "astrologer."[7] D.R. Dicks even argues "that Hipparchus' contemporary fame rested largely on his astrological work. . . ."[8] At any rate, by Ptolemy's time, in the second century C.E., astrology had become as rigorous a science as mathematical astronomy, at least in a formalistic sense, and this increasing esotericism, combined with widespread acceptance of its fatalistic assumptions, must have made it an imposing doctrine in the minds of many, for one does find much evidence in late antiquity of serious discontent over astrological implications, along with an accompanying desire to elude fate.

Two reasons can account for such a desire to escape fate. (1) Obviously, one's fate in this world *can* seem unendurable. Some people who consulted astrologers for help sought to know their fate in order to outwit it; others, though they may have looked to the stars to seek foreknowledge, also foresaw that ordinary human efforts lack sufficient power to cheat fate. These

---

[4] Richard Olson, *Science Deified and Science Defied* (Berkeley, 1982), 48; on the Egyptian contribution to deterministic views, cf. L. Kákosy, "Decans in Late-Egyptian Religion," *Oikumene* 3 (Budapest, 1982), 163-191.

[5] Otto Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (Providence, 1970), 156-157.

[6] Georg Luck, *Arcana Mundi* (Baltimore and London, 1985), 310.

[7] Neugebauer, 187, ad 68.

[8] D.R. Dicks, *The Geographical Fragments of Hipparchus* (London Univ., The Athlone Pr., 1960), 14.

people therefore turned to extraordinary means for protection, relying upon amulets and charms, or reciting magical incantations,[9] by which, they hoped to ward off an evil fate in *this* world. (2) But, what of the soul's fate? Belief in spiritual immortality had spread as widely as astrology itself,[10] and many people believed in a celestial home for the soul either in the sphere of fixed stars or just beyond. The problem lay in getting past the planetary spheres after death, for this required even more extraordinary measures.

Different texts, accordingly, promised to reveal such measures. Following some texts, one had to maneuver one's way through the planetary spheres, propitiating the relevant astral power at each level.[11] Following other texts, one had to invoke the planets directly, addressing them as gods[12] and requesting knowledge of the true path upward. Still others suggested the importance of extrastellar, divinely revealed passwords for use at each stage of ascent, while yet others appealed to soteriological deities powerful enough to *control* fate, such as Isis, Mithras, Jesus, Manda d'Hayye, and many more. The most fascinating of such savior-figures had, according to their believers, actually taken it upon themselves to descend into the cosmos all the way down to the depths of the sublunar realm in order to make the return ascension through the seven planetary spheres and beyond, thereby clearing a path all the way up into the perfect, heavenly realm for their initiates to follow. We find this descending-ascending motif the most pronounced of all in Gnosticism, for *because* the savior's physical *and metaphysical* distance from the cosmos exceeds that of redeemers in other salvation cults, by *descending* into the world to loosen fate's bonds, he puts himself at the *same risk*—ostensibly, anyway—that Sophia faced in *falling* into the world, testing his mettle against that of the planets and potentially subjecting himself to destiny's rule, but nevertheless overcoming it.[13]

The better to understand this risk—and the pathos of the Gnostic condition—let us hear the following plaint from the Mandaean Gnostic sect:

---

[9] Luck, 18, 38, and 317.

[10] F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York, 1956), 39.

[11] "Mithras Liturgy," transl. Marvin W. Meyer, *The Ancient Mysteries* (San Francisco, Harper and Row, 1987), 211-221; cf. "The 'Mithras Liturgy'" (PGM IV, 475-829), transl. Marvin W. Meyer, in H.D. Betz (Ed.), *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation* (Chicago, 1986), 48-54; and cf. also Cumont, 183-191.

[12] David Pingree, "Astrology," in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, Vol. I (New York, 1973), 125; cf. H.G. Gundel, *Weltbild und Astrologie in den griechischen Zauberpapyri* (München, 1968).

[13] Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston, 1963), 127-128.

Why did the creator[14] come into being,
and why did he create the world?
Why did fate[15] come into being,
and why did they bring me from my place?
They sent me into a world of stumbling
utterly full of entanglements[16] and traps,[17]
Utterly full (of) fire,
and sown with thorns and thistles—
Utterly full of illusions,
utterly full of deceit and falsehood.
The planets, which inhabit it,
daily scheme evil against me.
They scheme against me in evil,
and they say, "We will divide his thoughts."
(Of) my heart, which is full of truth,
they say, "We will make it err through us."
(Of) my eyes, which gaze at the light,
they say, "They shall blink furtively."[18]
(Of) my mouth, which blesses life,
they say, "It shall speak falsehood."
(Of) my hands, which give alms,
they say, "They shall murder."[19]
(Of) my knees, which worship life,
they say, "They shall worship the seven."[20]
(Of) my feet, which tread paths of truth,
they say, "They shall walk in violence"[21] (Lidzbarski, *Liturgien*, 161-162).[22]

Such a passage reveals both the insistent, anxious questions concerning fate and creation posed by the fearful Gnostic and the constant, terrifying dangers confronting the Gnostic trapped in this evil world. Still other Mandaean passages mournfully bewail the power of the planets to force the Gnostic

---

[14] "Ptahil," the Mandaean demiurge; from *PTH*, "to create" + *il*, a theomorphic ending; E.S. Drower and R. Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963), 384a (ptahil).

[15] Literally, "plan," "scheme," "plot," Drower, *Dictionary*, 127b (hašabta 1), but the verses below on the "scheming" of the "planets" indicate that this term refers to *fate*.

[16] Literally, "knots," Drower, *Dictionary*, 89b (giṭra).

[17] Literally, "seals," Drower, *Dictionary*, 128b (hatma).

[18] Literally, "winks shall wink," Drower, *Dictionary*, 433b (rimza), 436a (RMZ).

[19] Literally, "killing shall kill," Drower, *Dictionary*, 75b (gaṭla 2) = 89b (giṭla), 87b (GṬL).

[20] I.e., "the planets," Drower, *Dictionary*, 452b (šuba 1).

[21] Literally, "barefoot," "in mourning," Drower, *Dictionary*, 147a (*hipia* 2); but perhaps "force," "violence," "injustice" 147a (hipa 2) intended.

[22] My translation; cf. Lidzbarski, *Liturgien*, 161-162.

to their will,[23] tearfully bemoan the ability of the zodiac to persecute the Gnostic,[24] and sorrowfully deplore the capacity of these stellar powers to isolate the Gnostic in this world.[25] All of these laments generally fit the stock form of "lamentation," but their emotion nonetheless rings true if one can only place oneself within the Gnostic's circumstances. Perhaps the best analogy, as Hans Jonas has emphasized, requires one to imagine oneself wandering anxiously through a foreign land of unknown tongue and unfamiliar customs, utterly lost and *overwhelmingly* alone—for *this* represents the forlorn state of the Gnostic soul.[26]

Breaking Fate

Nevertheless, the Gnostic redeemer, commissioned to retrieve the lost spiritual power that resides in human bodies (by now, only within the bodies of certain people, the "elect"), makes the tortuous descent into the material realm all the way down to the earth. At times, as in the *Hymn of the Pearl*, he apparently even succumbs to the world's false charms and temporarily falls into "forgetfulness."[27] But eventually overcoming these dangers, the Gnostic redeemer eludes fate, escapes upward through the planetary spheres, and shatters the force of destiny (though sometimes, by contrast, this breaking of fate occurs during a descent).

A very interesting account of one way the redeemer actually accomplishes this appears in two Gnostic texts, the *Trimorphic Protennoia* (in a short, somewhat-obscure passage) and the *Pistis Sophia* (in several longer, far-more-explicit passages). The first selection comes from the former, an early Gnostic work possibly dating to second-century-C.E. Alexandria.[28] The lines chosen, using eschatological language and imagery to describe the Gnostic

---

[23] Lidzbarski, *Ginza: Der Schatz oder Das Grosse Buch der Mandäer* (Götting, 1925), 455.

[24] Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer* (Giessen, 1915), 62.

[25] Lidzbarski, *Ginza*, 263-264.

[26] Jonas, 65-68.

[27] Although often interpreted as symbolizing the soul in its existence within the lower, cosmic realm, the figure of the prince may—at least in part—also represent the descending-ascending redeemer, for he leaves his own, higher realm in order to descend to the lower one, where he carries out his mission of taking a pearl from the clutches of a dragon, afterwards returning with this pearl to his own, higher realm.

[28] Bently Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures* (New York, 1987), 5, 20; John D. Turner, "Introduction to 'Trimorphic Protennoia'" (XIII, 1), in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (San Francisco, 1988), 511-513; cf. also Turner's introductory remarks in NHC XIII, I, *Trimorphic Protennoia*, in NHS Vol. XXVIII, ed. Charles W. Hedrick (E.J. Brill, 1990), 401.

redeemer's descent, deal with the antepenultimate stage—at least in the extant text—of the struggle between good and evil:

> And the lots of *fate*[29] and those who measure the *houses*[30] became greatly disturbed on account of[31] a loud, heavenly voice.[32] And the thrones[33] of the powers, having *turned*,[34] became disturbed, and their king became afraid, and *those who run courses after fate*[35] abandoned[36] their number of *circular motions* along the *path* (i.e., the ecliptic), and they said to the powers, "What is this disturbance and this movement that came down upon us through a hidden voice from the exalted voice? And our entire habitation[37] moved, and the entire *circuit* of our *path* of *ascent*[38] met destruction, and the *path* that we go on—this one that takes us up to the Archigenetor of our birth—has ceased to be established for us" (emphasis mine) (*Trimorphic Protennoia*, 43: 13-26).[39]

---

[29] As Turner points out (in NHS Vol. XXVIII, ed. Charles W. Hedrick, 446, note to 43,13), the "lots of fate" (κλῆροι εἱμαρμένης) possibly refers to the κλῆροι τύχης—the "lots of fortune" in Ptolemy's astrological work, *Tetrabiblos* III, 10.129—which fall to a particular individual as determined by the relative positions of the sun, moon, and ascendant zodiacal sign at his/her birth.

[30] Turner also points out (*ibid.*, 446, note to 43,14) the relevance of the *oikos* system here, which alloted each planet and its celestial deity patronage over a specific zodiacal sign—its "house"—again citing Ptolemy's *Tetrabiblos* (I, 17.37).

[31] Could one also translate ⲁⲩⲱⲧⲟⲣⲧⲣ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁ ⲉⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲭⲛ̄ as "became disturbed 'in the rising up' on account of" (i.e., "in the ascension," taking ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲁ ⲉⲣⲁⲓ as a unit rather than ⲉⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲭⲛ̄)? This would fit the astrological language used here.

[32] The expression ϩⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲉ often means "thunder," but see 43,21.

[33] Turner understands the term "thrones" (θρόνοι) as refering to the planets, the "seats" of the celestial deities (*ibid.*, 446, note to 43,15-16), but it must, instead, refer here to the positions of the ruling deities of the twelve signs of the zodiac, the "powers" (δύναμεις), for the next line—those who run courses after "fate"—refers to the planets.

[34] On this "turning," see the discussion below on both the "turning" and the "rotating" in the *Pistis Sophia*.

[35] As Layton points out (*The Gnostic Scriptures*, 96, note d), this expression—"those who run courses after fate"—refers to the planets; note, moreover, that they ask the powers about the source of the hidden voice that has disturbed the cosmos, a question that only makes sense if the powers occupy a higher position in the hierarchy of cosmic things.

[36] Cf. Crum 392b for a possible meaning of † as "abandon."

[37] This probably refers to the entire cosmos.

[38] As noted above (43,18), the "path" refers to the ecliptic; Turner suggests (*ibid.*, 446, note to 43,23-24) that the phrase "the entire circuit of our path" derives from an expression in Greek astrology: πᾶσα ἡ περίοδος τῆς ἀνόδου ἡμῶν.

[39] NHC XIII, I, *Trimorphic Protennoia*, 43: 13-26, my trans., but following that of John D. Turner, in NHS Vol. XXVIII, ed. Charles W. Hedrick, 419.

The phrase "those who run courses after fate" refers, naturally, to the planets, and like them, one might *also* wonder what has happened.

By way of explanation, one should turn to particular selections[40] from the other above-mentioned Gnostic text, the *Pistis Sophia* (also apparently from Alexandria, but perhaps a hundred or so years after, in the late third century C.E.).[41] In the selection that follows below, Jesus's disciples have just queried him concerning the "disturbance" they had witnessed in the heavens, and—this being a revelation discourse—he agrees to tell them everything openly. First, he describes for them his ascent all the way up to the sphere of "fate" (i.e., that sphere encompassing the great circle of the twelve zodiacal constellations, arranged along the ecliptic, which constitute the backdrop before which the seven planets of antiquity moved in their annual motion). Then, after having described his journey up to this sphere, he proceeds to explain what he did once he arrived there:

> And (as for) *fate* and its *sphere*, over which they (i.e., the twelve aeons—the zodiac)[42] rule, I *turned* them and caused that they spend six months *rotated*[43] to the left—and they complete their (periods of) influence—and six months gazing to (the) right completing their (periods of) influence (emphasis mine) (*Pistis Sophia*, I: 15).[44]

Having said this, Jesus challenges his listeners to explain his action,[45] and in response, Mary Magdalene (called both Maria and Mariam in the text) volunteers to answer, suggesting that Jesus has acted as he did in order to invalidate the predictions of astrologers:

> You have taken their power from them (the archons)[46] and their *astrologers* and their soothsayers and the ones who tell men who are in the world everything that will happen so that from this hour, they might not understand things

---

[40] The Mithraic scholar D. Ulansey has directed my attention to these passages.

[41] Carl Schmidt, *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften* I, 3rd ed. by Walter Till (Berlin, 1962), XXIV.

[42] The previous passage has just referred to all of the aeons, specifically including the *twelve* aeons—i.e., the twelve aeons of the zodiac—as disturbed and fleeing and moving counter to one another.

[43] I prefer to translate ⲕⲱⲧⲉ here as "rotate" both to remain consistent with the translation below and to reflect its distinction from ⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ, translated as "turn."

[44] *The Coptic Gnostic Library, Pistis Sophia*, I, 15 (cf. Violet MacDermot and Carl Schmidt, transl. and eds., respectively [Leiden, 1978]), Codex pp. 25, 16-20, my trans., closely following Schmidt and MacDermot.

[45] *Ibid.*, I, 17.

[46] The archons of the 7 planets and of the 12 signs of the zodiac.

about to happen so as to tell (i.e., *predict*) them, for you have *turned* their *spheres* . . . (emphasis mine) (*Pistis Sophia*, I: 18).[47]

"Excellent, Mary," Jesus then commends her, "You are blessed beyond all women upon earth."[48]

Jesus's response encourages Mary, and she follows up with a question of her own, wondering *why* what Jesus did works, to which she receives this rather lengthy, technical answer:

When the astrologers find *fate* and its[49] *sphere rotated*[50] to (the) left, according to its first distribution, their words agree and they will speak what is due to happen, but when they meet *fate or* its *sphere rotated* to (the) right, they never say anything true because I (have) *rotated* their (fate and its sphere's)[51] (periods of) influence and their squares and their triangles and their figure(s) of eight—for their (periods of) influence were originally *turned* continuously to (the) left, along with their squares and their triangles and figure(s) of eight. Now, however, I have caused them to spend six months *rotated* to (the) left and six months *rotated* to (the) right. Therefore, the one who will find their reckoning from the time that I *turned* them, having placed them to spend six months looking to their left paths and six months looking to their right paths—the one, therefore, who will consult them in this way—will know their (periods of) influence with certainty, and he will proclaim everything that will be done. Similarly, also, when the soothsayers invoke the names of the archons and meet them looking to (the) left, everything that they will seek of their decans concerning themselves, they will be told with certainty. However, when their soothsayers invoke their names as they are looking to (the) right, they (i.e., the soothsayers) will not be heard because they (i.e., the soothsayers) see[52] another form than their (i.e., the archons') first condition, in which Jeu established them, for their names are one thing when they are *rotated* to (the) left and another thing when they are *rotated* to (the) right. And when they invoke them as they are *rotated* to (the) right, they (the archons) will not speak the truth to them, but rather, they will greatly distress them, and they will greatly

---

[47] *Ibid.*, I, 18; Codex pp. 27, 10-18, my trans., closely following Schmidt and MacDermot.

[48] *Ibid.*, I, 17-19; Codex pp. 26-28, quote: pp. 28, 21-22.

[49] I interpret ⲦⲈⲤⲪⲀⲒⲢⲀ as a haplography for ⲦⲈⲤⲤⲪⲀⲒⲢⲀ since this makes more sense in the context: The ecliptic—or heimarmene, the circle of "fate"—defines the zodiacal band on the celestial sphere of the fixed stars; one cannot really treat the circle of "fate" and the "sphere" as two completely separate things.

[50] I prefer to translate ⲔⲰⲦⲈ in this passage as "rotate" because it seems to fit the sense of Jesus's activity.

[51] This possessive pronoun also includes the archons of fate and its sphere (i.e., the zodiac and the sphere upon which it lies), as the rest of the passage makes explicit—especially towards the end of the section quoted here.

[52] I suggest a *transitive* meaning here for ⲥⲱⲱⲧ.

> threaten them. Therefore, those (i.e., the soothsayers and astrologers) who do not know their (the archons') paths as they are *rotated* to (the) right—along with their triangles and their squares and all their figures—will find nothing true, but, rather, they will become very greatly distressed, and they will be in great *error*, and they will be very greatly misled, for the works that they (i.e., the archons) do in the time when they are *rotated* to (the) left in their squares, in their triangles, and in their figures of eight—these (works) that they continued doing as they were *rotated* to the left—I have now changed them (i.e., the works). And I have caused them (the archons) to spend six months making all their patterns *rotated* to (the) right so that they should be greatly distressed in their whole circuit.[53] And, also, I have caused them to spend six months *rotated* to (the) left, doing the works of their (periods of) influence and all their patterns so that the archons who exist in the *aeons*, and in their *spheres*, and in their heavens, and in all their places might be greatly distressed and might *wander* in *error* so that they might not understand their own *paths* (*Pistis Sophia*, I: 21).[54]

Despite Jesus's answer's reliance upon rather arcane points of astrology, the disciples apparently understand this explanation perfectly well, for rather than exhibiting any curiosity about the mechanical workings of the cosmos, they go on to ask about the value of Jesus's actions in the economy of salvation.

But perhaps *today* one would like to focus upon what Jesus claims to have done. The text employs a lot of astrological jargon: "squares," "triangles," "figure eight," and "(periods of) influence" in the above selection, as well as "aspects" and "decans" elsewhere in the same text. To understand these within some kind of coherent order, one should remind oneself of ancient astrology's basic picture. The sun's annual path eastward takes it along the great circle of the ecliptic through twelve signs of 30 degrees each, the zodiac, which—by analogy to the sun's annual direction of motion—also curves across the heavens from west to east. If one draws a circle and divides it into a dozen, thirty-degree arcs, superimposing the twelve zodiacal signs upon these in a counterclockwise order—as conventionally viewed from the cosmic sphere's north pole—a single sign per arc, then one has a schematic map of the influential part of the heavens: Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricorn, Aquarius, and Pisces. One can further subdivide such a schematic map

---

[53] Literally, "filling," "completion," but MacDermot's suggestion seems to fit well here.

[54] *Ibid.*, I, 21; Codex pp. 30, 7-5; 31, 26; 32, 1-4, my trans., closely following Schmidt and MacDermot.

into 36 "decans" of ten degrees each for greater precision in calculating one's fate. But to do such a calculation, one has to introduce the seven planets and locate them upon this map. If one assigns a specific influence to each planet *and* to each sign, then the shifting influences of the whole system in motion gets rather complex. Moreover, each sign has *predetermined* relations to certain other signs—for instance, the two signs at 90 degrees of arc to either side of a given sign compose the "squares" mentioned above; those at 120 degrees of arc, the "triangles." These angles eventually became known as the sign's aspects.[55]

Consequently, Jesus seems to be telling his disciples that he somehow grasped ahold of the sphere of the zodiac, rotating it first to the left for six months, then to the right for six months. From his disciples' perspective on the earth, this means the stars would seem to move *eastward* along the ecliptic for six months, then reverse themselves and move *westward* along the ecliptic for six months. The actual time elapsed, from the disciples' point of view, took only thirty hours, for the text also explicitly says that the "disturbance" of the powers in the heavens moving "against one another" lasted "from the third hour of the fifteenth of the moon in (the month of) Tobe until the ninth hour of the following day."[56] Clearly then, the passage uses the "six months" symbolically, referring to the rotating of the zodiac 180 degrees one way, then 180 degrees the other (six months, being half the year, equals half of 360 degrees, i.e., 180 degrees). And the point of this great *commotion*, as Mary Magdalene guessed and Jesus confirmed, lay in confusing the astrologers *and the planets themselves*, for the terms translated above as "wander" and "error"[57] come over into Coptic directly from the Greek, πλανάω and πλάνη, respectively, both clearly *meant* as puns upon the word "planet," πλανήτης.[58] But where on *earth* did the Gnostics get this notion of rotating the zodiac to break fate's hold?

Precession

To answer this question, one need only draw further upon the astronomical knowledge known to antiquity. Already in the 2nd century B.C.E.,

---

[55] Cf., for example, A. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'Astrologie grecque* (Paris, 1899; Darmstadt, 1979).

[56] *Pistis Sophia*, I, 4; Codex pp. 6, 16-19.

[57] *Ibid.*, I, 21; Codex pp. 31, 26-32, 1.

[58] Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Cambridge, 1968), 671-672.

the Greek astronomer Hipparchus had discovered the precession of the equinoxes, a hitherto-unknown, apparent motion of the cosmic sphere acting to shift the ecliptic in such a way that, over time, each one of the zodiacal constellations would pass through the vernal and autumnal equinoxes.[59] Here, one should note precisely *what* Hipparchus thought he had discovered. Using the astronomical observations of the longitudes of certain stars made by Timocharis between 294 and 283 B.C.E., as well as even earlier observations taken from the Babylonians, Hipparchus noted an apparent eastward shift of the zodiac, such that the bright star *Spica*, in the sign of Virgo, which he found in 129 B.C.E. to be *six degrees* west of the autumnal equinox, Timocharis had earlier found to be *eight*.[60] The second-century-C.E. astronomer Ptolemy cites him on this:

> ὅ τε γὰρ Ἵππαρχος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς μεταπτώσεως τῶν τροπικῶν καὶ ἰσημερινῶν σημείων παρατιθέμενος ἐκλείψεις σεληνιακὰς ἔκ τε τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν τετηρημένων ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔτι πρότερον ὑπὸ Τιμοχάριδος ἐπιλογίζεται τὸν Στάχυν ἀπέχοντα τοῦ μετοπωρινοῦ σημείου εἰς τὰ προηγούμενα ἐν μὲν τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτὸν χρόνοις μοίρας ϛ, ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατὰ Τιμόχαριν ᾗ ἔγγιστα μοίρας· (Ptolemy, *Almagest*, VII, 2)[61]
>
> So, then, in his work *On the Change of the Tropic and Equinoctial Signs*, Hipparchus compares eclipses of the moon both from those carefully observed by him and from those already previously observed by Timocharis, and he calculates Spica Virginis at 6 degrees west of the autumnal sign (i.e., of the equinox) in his time but approximately 8 degrees west (of it) in Timocharis's time.[62]

According to Ptolemy, Hipparchus then reckoned this precession eastward to occur at the rate of one degree per century:[63]

> ὡς ἐκ τούτων τὴν τῆς μιᾶς μοίρας εἰς τὰ ἑπόμενα παραχώρησιν ἐν ἑκατὸν ἔγγιστα ἔτεσιν γεγενημένην εὑρῆσθαι, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Ἵππαρχος ὑπονενοηκὼς φαίνεται, δι' ὧν φησιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ ἐνιαυσίου μεγέθους οὕτως· "Εἰ γὰρ παρὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν αἵ τε τροπαὶ καὶ ἰσημερίαι μετέβαινον εἰς τὰ προηγούμενα τῶν ζῳδίων ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ μὴ ἔλασσον ἢ ἑκατοστὸν μιᾶς μοίρας, ἔδει ἐν τοῖς τριακοσίοις ἔτεσιν μὴ ἔλασσον ἢ γ̄ μοίρας αὐτὰ μεταβεβηκέναι" (Ptolemy, VII, 2).[64]

---

[59] Cf. David Ulansey's fascinating application of this ancient discovery to an analysis of Mithraic iconography: *The Origins of the Mithraic Mysteries* (Oxford University Press, 1989).

[60] J.L.E. Dreyer, *A History of Astronomy* (Dover, 1953), 203.

[61] Claudii Ptolemaei, *Opera Quae Exstant Omnia*, Vol. I, *Syntaxis Mathematica* (i.e., *Almagest*), Pars II, Libros VII-XIII Continens, ed. J.L. Heiberg (Leipzig, 1903), 12-13.

[62] My translation; cf. G.J. Toomer, *Ptolemy's Almagest*, VII, 2 (Duckworth, 1984), 327.

[63] Dreyer, 203.

[64] Heiberg, 15-16.

> Thus, from this, a displacement of 1 degree eastward in approximately 100 years has come to be found, just as Hipparchus also seems to have suspected, for in his work *On the Magnitude of the Year*, he says the following: "For if, because of this reason, both the tropics (i.e., the solstices) and the equinoxes moved not less than 1/100th of a degree westward in the course of a year, (then) they must have moved not less than 3 degrees (westward) in the (past) 300 years."[65]

Thus did Ptolemy interpret Hipparchus from the evidence presented in two of the latter's astronomical works, *On the Change of the Solsticial and Equinoctial Signs* and *On the Magnitude of the Year*.

"Trepidation"

Otto Neugebauer, however, has presented strong evidence that Hipparchus actually calculated the movement as significantly faster than this—not one degree per century, but about one degree per 77 years instead (based partly upon the very information Ptolemy himself provides, for Ptolemy's own records show that the 154 years between Timocharis and Hipparchus saw the star Spica shift about 2 degrees eastward).[66] Moreover, Neugebauer thinks that Hipparchus may have considered the motion *periodic*, moving to the east for a period of years, then reversing itself and moving to the west for an equal number of years.[67] If so, this might help explain the origin of the pre-Ptolemaic theory of "trepidation" recorded by the fourth-century-C.E. writer Theon of *Alexandria*[68] (a Gnostic center!), who—phrasing it in terms of the *solstices* rather than the equinoxes—relates the following:

> Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ κατά τινας δόξας βούλονται οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν ἀποτελεσματικῶν τὰ τροπικὰ σημεῖα ἀπό τινος ἀρχῆς χρόνου εἰς τὰ ἑπόμενα μετακινεῖσθαι μοίρας η̄, καὶ πάλιν τὰς αὐτὰς ὑποστρέφειν. . . . Λαμβάνοντες γὰρ τὰ πρὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς Αὐγούστου βασιλείας ἔτη ϱ̄κ̄η̄ ὡς τότε τῆς μεγίστης μεταβάσεως τῶν η̄ μοιρῶν γεγενημένης, καὶ ἀρχὴν λαμβανόντων ὑποστρέφειν, καὶ τούτοις προστιθέντες τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς Αὐγούστου βασιλείας ἕως τῆς Διοκλητιανοῦ ἀρχῆς ἔτη τ̄ῑγ̄ καὶ τὰ ἀναδιδόμενα ἀπὸ Διοκλητιανοῦ

---

[65] My translation; cf. Toomer, *Almagest*, VII, 2, p. 328.

[66] *Almagest*, VII, 2, pp. 327-328, 333, 336.

[67] Neugebauer, *A History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy*, 3 vols. (Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1975), 298.

[68] Dreyer, 203-204; also recorded by Proclus (ca. 450 C.E.), *Hypotypopsis* III, 54; cf. C. Manitius, ed., *Procli Diadochi Hypotyposis astronomicarum positionum* (with German trans.) (Leipzig, Teubner, 1909), 66, 69.

> καὶ τῶν συναγομένων τὸ ὀγδοηκοστὸν λαμβάνοντες ὡς κατὰ π ἔτη μίαν μοῖραν αὐτῶν μετακινουμένων . . . (Theon of Alexandria, *Little Commentary*).[69]
>
> According to certain opinions, old-fashioned astrologers imagine the tropical (i.e., solstitial) signs to move themselves 8 degrees eastward from a particular starting point and afterwards to return. . . . They assume the greatest shift—8 degrees—as having taken place 128 years before the beginning of the Augustan reign, the motion (afterward) having begun to reverse itself. They add to this (i.e., to the 128 years) the 313 years from the beginning of the Augustan reign to the beginning of the Diocletian one, and then also the time elapsed since Diocletian (i.e., 77 years), and of the (entire) sum (i.e., 518 years), they take the 80th (part), for in 80 years, a one-degree shift occurs. . . .[70]

As Neugebauer points out, this assumption of one degree change per 80 years scarcely differs from Hipparchus's value of one degree per 77 years (1280 or 1232 years, respectively, for the entire oscillatory process: 8 degrees forward, 8 degrees back). This provides strong evidence that these *astrologers'* reinterpretation of the precession of the equinoxes as a periodic oscillation of the starry sphere comes directly from Hipparchus.[71]

And *this* may explain how the Gnostics learned of it, for they seem quite familiar with astrological doctrine. But whereas Hipparchus and the astrologers seem to have interpreted this periodic shift as "uniformitarian" (though Hipparchus may also, in fact, have left the constancy of its rate of motion in doubt),[72] the Gnostics reinterpreted the astrological texts to their own advantage, emphasizing its *miraculous* nature by exaggerating the oscillatory motion from 8 degrees to 180 degrees and simultaneously so greatly accelerating it that this oscillation required only 30 *hours* rather than 1232 (or 1280?) *years*, by which changes, they thereby presented a "catastrophist" rather than "uniformitarian" hypothesis to explain the mysterious shifting of the sphere of fate. Consequently, Jesus's turning of the zodiac, as described in the *Pistis Sophia*—first to the left for six months, then back to the right for six months—may signify none other than a *catastrophist* reading of this theory of oscillation, such that, contrary to the astrologers' *uniformitarian* assumptions, the precession of the equinoxes visibly declares the *power* of the god *not* of this world *to disturb* the frighteningly regular motions of the heavens

---

[69] A. Tihon, *Le "Petit Commentaire" de Théon d'Alexandrie aux Tables Faciles de Ptolémée* (12: 4-6, 11-16), *Studi e Testi* 282 (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1978), 236.

[70] My translation; cf. Tihon, 319 and Dreyer, 203-204.

[71] Neugebauer, *Hist.*, 298.

[72] Neugebauer, *Hist.*, 631.

and effectively free the Gnostics from the "glittering tyranny"[73] of the stars.

This sort of interpretation probably places at least these Gnostics outside of antiquity's intellectual elite, possibly within a literate though *not* professionally intellectual class, for any astute astronomer or astrologer would instantly have spotted the crucial contradiction: Evidence for the ecliptic's motion had come from several centuries of careful observations, none of which suggested any rapid, discontinuous revolutions in the heavens, yet Gnostics used the astronomers' proof of the ecliptic's slow, uniform motion in order to ground their own belief in the ecliptic's rapid, discontinuous oscillation. Nevertheless, such an interpretation of precession, one emphasizing its precipitate occurrence, could perhaps help explain how the term "trepidation" (from *trepidatio*, viz., "hurry and confusion") found itself applied to Hipparchus's theory of the oscillation of the equinoxes, for Hipparchus himself had conceived of the motion as neither hurried nor confused. A view of trepidation like the Gnostic one presented in this paper, however, *would* make the term fit.[74]

Department of Philosophy, University of New England,
Armidale, NSW 2351, Australia

[73] Blumenberg, *The Genesis of the Copernican World* (Cambridge, 1987), 23.

[74] John Heilbron, Private Correspondence, February 20, 1990; Neugebauer, *Hist.*, 631, holds that the term "trepidation" refers to the motion's "limited amplitude," but it more likely refers primarily to the motion's (putative) non-constant rate (Cf. ref. 72).

PROSŌPON AND *HYPOSTASIS* IN BASIL OF CAESAREA'S *AGAINST EUNOMIUS* AND THE EPISTLES

BY

LUCIAN TURCESCU

St. Basil of Caesarea's contribution to the shaping of trinitarian theology was paramount. Although he died on January 1, 379, before the Second Ecumenical Council (Constantinople, 381), it can be claimed that this very council represented Basil's posthumous triumph over his doctrinal enemies because of the creed it sanctioned. Since the synod accepted Basil's moderate formula in regard to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, one can say that Basil even triumphed over his friend Gregory of Nazianzus and his brother Gregory of Nyssa who insisted on a more explicit affirmation of the divinity of the Spirit. It is, therefore, Basil's terminology that I want to deal with in this article; yet I shall focus on a pair of terms different from the pair usually examined by historians of dogma.

When discussing Basil's trinitarian theology, scholars usually take into account the pair οὐσία-ὑπόστασις, explaining how Basil distinguished between the two. So far very few have been interested in a systematic study of another pair to which Basil paid much heed, namely πρόσωπον-ὑπόστασις, which I propose to analyze in this article. To my knowledge, there are actually only three somewhat more systematic studies of the latter pair, but they, too, have their deficiencies or offer too brief a treatment of the topic.[1] The remainder of the scholarly studies of the two terms in the Cappadocians are only scattered chapters in articles or books whose main topics are more general; they either mention the Cappadocians very briefly in a larger context or confine themselves to one or two of their works and present them very briefly. Another category comprises the studies that deal

[1] A. Michel, "Hypostase" in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1922) 369-437; Jürgen Hammerstaedt, "Hypostasis (ὑπόστασις)" in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* vol. 16 (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1994) 986-1035; André de Halleux, "'Hypostase' et 'personne' dans la formation du dogme trinitaire (ca. 375-381)," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 79 (1984) 313-369, 625-670.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

with either of the two terms, but do not touch on the Cappadocians. Consequently, a systematic evaluation of the meanings of the two terms in the thought of the Cappadocian Fathers (and not only in them) is badly needed. I confine this study to some writings of Basil, namely *Against Eunomius* and the relevant *Epistles*, in order to show the development Basil's thought knew in regard to the meanings of the two terms. This evaluation contributes to the understanding of the concept of person which in my view owes a lot to the fourth-century trinitarian disputes.

Against Eunomius

I start by analyzing the two terms in Basil of Caesarea's *Against Eunomius* 1-3 (*CEun* hereafter), because this is one of his earliest theological works, written in the 360s.[2] Moreover, as I shall prove, a certain development in the use of ὑπόστασις can be detected in Basil's thought as early as *CEun*. Concerning the date of *CEun*, scholars agree that it should have been written at the beginning of Basil's theological activity, i.e., in the first half of the 360s. Nevertheless, the most prudent scholars place it between 360 and 366,[3] while others between 363 and 365.[4] In taking into account Basil's *Ep.* 223,5, addressed to his mentor of asceticism, Eustathius of Sebaste, B. Sesboüé and P. Fedwick date *CEun* before the fall of 364, when the Synod of Lampsacus took place.[5] In *Ep.* 223,5, Basil reminds his mentor, bishop Eustathius of Sebaste, that at Eusinoe, he (i.e., Eustathius) and a large number of bishops were about to leave for the Synod of Lampsacus.

---

[2] Greek text in Basil of Caesarea, *Contre Eunome suivi de Eunome, "Apologie,"* introduction, translation and notes by B. Sesboüé with the collaboration of G.-M. de Durand and Louis Doutreleau for the critical text and introduction, 2 vols., SC 299, 305 (Paris: Cerf, 1982-1983). Unless otherwise specified, the English translations of Greek texts are mine throughout this article.

[3] Th. Dams, "La controverse eunoméenne" (doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Theology, Institut Catholique de Paris, 1952) 6.

[4] J. Quasten, *Patrology* 3 (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1960) 209; Gustave Bardy, art. "Basile" in *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques* 6 (Paris: Letouzey, 1932) 1123; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (Rome: Augustinianum, 1975) 455: Dom Maran, *Vita S. Basilii Magni*, VIII, 7 (PG 29, p. xxxvi b-c); W.-D. Hauschild indicates A.D. 364/365 in Basil of Caesarea, *Briefe*, tr. W.-D. Hauschild, 3 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1993) 277.

[5] B. Sesboüé, "Introduction" in Basil, *Contre Eunome*, 1.42 f. Paul J. Fedwick, "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea" in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteenth-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, ed. Paul J. Fedwick 1 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981) 10 f., n. 57.

It was then that many tachygraphers surrounded Basil, while he was "dictating the arguments against the heresy."[6] J. Gribomont delays the dates of *CEun* and the Synod of Lampsacus to 365,[7] although the date of this synod, fall 364, is well established.[8] In his dating *CEun* to 360 or 361, T. Kopecek relies on the information contained in *Ep.* 20 rather than *Ep.* 223,5 and with Tillemont dates the former to 362.[9] In *Ep.* 20.25 Basil tells a sophist named Leontius: "I sent you my writings against Eunomius."[10] It is true that the reference to "arguments against the heresy" (*Ep.* 223,5) is not as explicit as "my writings against Eunomius" (*Ep.* 20.25). Yet, besides *CEun*, there is no other Basilian *doctrinal* writing of that period so important as to be ordered by bishops for use at a synod. In that period Basil wrote a lot, but his writings are either moral and ascetical, or homilies, or letters. It is very unlikely that the writing of any of these, except *CEun*, was assisted by a large number of bishops. Therefore, it seems to me that *Ep.* 223,5 alludes indeed to *CEun*, and consequently *Ep.* 20 should be dated sometime after the Synod of Lampsacus. In this case the date of completion of *CEun* is 364.

In *CEun* Basil does not use πρόσωπον as a term with special connotations, nor does he dismiss it, as he would do later in the trinitarian disputes. Sometimes, πρόσωπον simply means "face" as in *CEun* 3,7.43 (669c): "we will be deemed worthy of a face-to-face contemplation" (τῆς πρὸς πρόσωπον θεωρίας). This is also the meaning encountered in the Septuagint and the New Testament, and Basil even mentions texts such as Lam. 4:20 or Mt. 18:10. In most of the fourteen passages where it occurs in this particular writing, πρόσωπον can be rendered as "person" in the widest sense and it is applied without reservations to both human and divine persons. Yet it does not seem to be a strong term; therefore, perhaps, Basil does not attach a special significance to it. In one passage, Basil hints at the meaning of πρόσωπον (person) as opposed to πρᾶγμα (thing). Thus, in a context in which he speaks against Eunomius, Basil says: "Having worn out his impiety apropos of things (τοῖς πράγμασι), [and] before passing to the consideration of persons (τὰ πρόσωπα), [Eunomius] wants to appear as

---

[6] Basil, *Lettres*, ed. Yves Courtonne, 3 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966) 14.

[7] J. Gribomont, "Les succès littéraires des Pères grecs et les problèmes d'histoire des textes," *Sacris erudiri* 22 (1974/1975) 31.

[8] Cf. Fedwick, "Chronology" 10 f., n. 57.

[9] Thomas A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism* 2 (Cambridge, MA: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979) 364-372.

[10] Basil, *Lettres*, ed. Yves Courtonne, 1 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957) 51.

having said nothing shocking" (*CEun* 1,16.30; 549a). In another passage πρόσωπον is an anthropomorphism which the French translator renders by "mouth" (*bouche*): "the word of the mouth of God" (ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ) (*CEun* 1,8.40; 528d). This is the only text in *CEun* where the expression πρόσωπον τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs; to translate πρόσωπον by "person" here could suggest the idea that there is only one person in the Godhead. Other texts where the phrase ἐκ προσώπου occurs (unaccompanied by the noun "God") can well be rendered as "attributed to the person of": "First, let us take from the Gospel the 'In the beginning was the Word' (Jn. 1:1), and from the Psalm this saying attributed to the person of the Father (ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Πατρὸς), 'From the womb I gave birth to you before the morning-star' (Ps. 109:3)." (*CEun* 2,17.24; 608a). Basil even mentions sayings "attributed to the person of the Lord" (ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου—*CEun* 2,18.17; 609a) or "attributed to the person of the Wisdom" (ἐκ προσώπου τῆς Σοφίας—*CEun* 2,20.17; 616b). Another meaning of πρόσωπον is that of "character" in a play; Basil uses the word with the alpha-privative prefix in order to say that Eunomius' *Apology* is a "characterless (ἀπρόσωπον) theatrical fiction" (*CEun* 1,2.36; 504b). He thinks this about the *Apology*, because, under the guise of this literary genre, Eunomius practises nothing but a *captatio benevolentiae* of his audience. In other words, there is no accuser to justify the writing of this apology. Thomas Kopecek thinks that when stating this, Basil has in mind the council held at Constantinople in December 359 where the Homoeans had the majority of votes on their side.[11]

Concerning the term ὑπόστασις in *CEun*, the texts where it occurs can be grouped under four main headings: substance, subsistence, substratum, and person. Thus, when quoting Heb. 1:3, Basil preserves the biblical meaning of "substance," although later both he and Gregory of Nyssa will give up this meaning in favor of that of "person."[12] At this point, ὑπόστασις is still synonymous with οὐσία, and Basil takes advantage of that in order to assert the consubstantiality of God the Father with his Son: "For it has been spoken of . . . the 'imprint of the substance' (χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως, Heb. 1:3), in order that we be taught the consubstantial (τὸ ὁμοούσιον)" (*CEun* 1,20.11; 556c).[13] When making this statement, did Basil have in mind

---

[11] T. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, 2. 304-306. For the December 359 council, *cf.* also J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (New York: Longman, ³1972) 292-3.

[12] Cf. *CEun* 3,3.5 (661a) which will be discussed below. Cf. also Gregory of Nyssa, *De diff. usiae et hyp.* 6-8 (= "Basil's" *Ep.* 38, Courtonne 1.89-91).

[13] *Homoousios* in regard to the Trinity is a *hapax legomenon* in *CEun*. Nevertheless, to affirm that the Son is divine Basil uses other expressions: "connaturality (συμφυές) with

the Councils of Nicaea (325) and especially Serdica (343), which condemned those who would say that the Son is of another ὑπόστασις or οὐσία than the Father, thereby making the two terms synonymous? Probably yes, although in *CEun* Basil uses another meaning of ὑπόστασις, namely "person," that overtly invalidate this old synonymy. However, he does not even allude to these councils in *CEun*. Later in this article I shall present Basil's interpretation of the formulations of these councils in regard to ὑπόστασις in his *Ep.* 125.

Basil also uses ὑπόστασις to express "something that has subsistence" or simply the "subsistence." Eunomius tries to show that the ungeneratedness of God the Father is not a human concept but God's very substance; therefore, the Son, being generated, is dissimilar (ἀνόμοιον) from the Father according to the very substance. In so doing, Eunomius disparages the term 'concept' as having no reality or subsistence (*Apol.* 8,1-6) or in Basil's words: "[Eunomius] clings to the term 'concept' (ἐπίνοια), as if it signified absolutely nothing and had no subsistence but in the act of its utterance (ἀλλ' ἐν μόνῃ τῇ προφορᾷ τὴν ὑπόστασιν κεκτημένῳ)" (*CEun* 1,5.133-137; 521a). To Basil, who plays the embarrassed because "constrained" to use Aristotelian language, God's ungeneratedness does not show *what [God] is* (τί ἐστιν) but *how he is* (ὅπως ἐστίν) (*CEun* 1,15; 545b). In this context, an interesting occurrence, although unique in *CEun*, is the phrase τρόπος τῆς ὑποστάσεως, since it announces another famous phrase used by Basil, namely τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως. Basil says that the τρόπος τῆς ὑποστάσεως shows *how* God is, not *what* he is; therefore, the τρόπος τῆς ὑποστάσεως in the case of God does not indicate God's nature (φύσις), nor in the case of human beings their material substratum (τὸ ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον) (*CEun* 1,15; 548a-b).

The third meaning of ὑπόστασις in *CEun* is that of "substratum." For example, in *CEun* 2,4 Basil refutes an assertion Eunomius made in his *Apology* 18,16-18 that "if names are different, substances are also different." He says:

> Whenever we hear "Peter," the name does not make us think of his substance—by substance (οὐσία) I mean now the material substratum (τὸ ὑλικὸν

---

the Father" (2,15.31) and "connaturality of the substance" (τὸ ὁμοφυὲς τῆς οὐσίας in 2,28.34). Even if, according to Gribomont ("Intransigence and Irenicism in Saint Basil's 'De Spiritu Sancto,'" *Word and Spirit* 1 [1979] 116) who follows Simonetti, Basil first appeared in a group of "Neo-Nicenes" who were basically of sound faith but did not accept the *homoousios* because it was not biblical, the occurrence of this term in a work written before the council of Lampsacus confirms Basil's change of attitude toward the *Nicaenum*.

> ὑποκείμενον), which the name never indicates—, but the notion of properties considered in regard to him is imprinted in us. This vocable makes us immediately think of the son of Jonah, born in Bethsaida, the brother of Andrew.... [N]one of these properties is his substance, conceived as substratum (ὧν οὐδεν ἐστιν οὐσία, ἡ ὡς ὑπόστασις νοουμένη). (*CEun* 2,4.9-18; 577c-580a)

At *CEun* 2,4.18 (580a) ὑπόστασις is synonym with ὑποκείμενον. Later on, Basil uses ὑπόστασις with this meaning several more times (e.g. 2,6.13 [581c]; 2,9.4 [588b]; 2,9.21 [588d]).

The fourth and last meaning ὑπόστασις has in this particular writing is that of "person." In *CEun* 3 Basil refers to the "three persons" in God, of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. In interpreting Is. 6:3, he writes: "It is therefore, I think, that it was written in Isaiah that the Seraphims cry three times 'Holy!', because the holiness according to nature is contemplated in the three persons (ἐν τρισὶ ταῖς ὑποστάσεσιν)" (*CEun* 3,3.2-5; 661a). The trinitarian context imposes the translation by "persons" and it should be noted that the phrase τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις is a *hapax legomenon* in *CEun*.

The Epistles

In this section I shall analyze the meanings of the two terms in Basil's letters. Since not all of the letters where these terms occur are of significant interest for the scope of this article, I confine my study to only several of them. Moreover, the ones I have chosen are among those unanimously recognized today as authentic. One of the most important letters scholars used to refer to when dealing with πρόσωπον, ὑπόστασις, and οὐσία is *Ep.* 38 of the Basilian corpus. Yet, scholarly studies such as those undertaken by Anders Cavallin,[14] Reinhard Hübner[15] and Paul Fedwick[16] have shown that in reality this letter belongs to St. Gregory of Nyssa, and most students

---

[14] Anders Cavallin, *Studien zu den Briefen des hl. Basilius* (Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1944) 71 ff.

[15] Reinhard Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser der sog. *Ep.* 38 des Basilius. Zum unterschiedlichen Verständnis der *ousia* bei den kappadozischen Brüdern" in *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques efforts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, eds. J. Fontaine and Ch. Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972) 463-490.

[16] Paul J. Fedwick "A Commentary of Gregory of Nyssa or the 38th Letter of Basil of Caesarea," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 44 (1978) 31-51. Robert Pouchet also accepts the Gregorian paternity in his comprehensive study of the Basilian correspondence, *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance. Une stratégie de communion* (Rome: Augustinianum, 1992) 29.

of St. Basil accept this today.[17] Therefore, I do not consider *Ep.* 38 in this article. Neither do I take into account some other letters that are spurious such as: *Ep.* 8 (= Evagrius Ponticus), *Ep.* 10 and *Ep.* 189 (= Gregory of Nyssa).[18] The letters I do consider in a chronological order are nos. 9, 52, 125, 210, 214 and 236.[19]

EPISTLE 9.[20] *Ep.* 9 is addressed to the enigmatic Maximus the Philosopher who asked Basil for some copies of the works of the third-century bishop Dionysius of Alexandria and wanted to hear Basil's opinion about the latter. *Ep.* 9 is believed to have been written at the beginning of the 360s. Yet, whereas Pouchet and Fedwick place it in 360-362,[21] Hauschild dates it to summer(?) of 364, that is, at the same time as *CEun.*[22] In my opinion, due to the precise terminology used and the distinctions made in section 2, this letter could have been written at the same time as *CEun* 2 or even 3, when Basil had started clarifying his thoughts about the trinitarian terminology, i.e., in 364. I elaborate below.

In *Ep.* 9, 2 Basil expounds his views about Dionysius of Alexandria's writings solicited by Maximus the Philosopher. In 263 Dionysius wrote a book entitled *Refutation and Apology*, addressed to his namesake, bishop Dionysius of Rome, in which he used the term *homoousios.*[23] Therefore, both Basil and Maximus think that they can learn a lesson from Dionysius' use of the *homoousios.* Basil says that Dionysius of Alexandria attempted to combat Sabellius. Yet, "although it was quite enough for him to show that the Father and the Son are not the same according to the subject (οὐ ταὐτὸν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ)," Dionysius went so far as to affirm in regard to the Father and the Son "not only a distinction of the persons (ἑτερότητα τῶν

---

[17] Nonetheless W.-D. Hauschild does not accept this attribution in his German translation of Basil's letters (see Basil, *Briefe* 1. (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1990) 182 ff., n. 181). Nor does Jürgen Hammerstaedt, "Zur Echtheit von Basiliusbrief 38," *Tesserae: Festschrift für Josef Engemann. Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 18 (1991) 416-419.

[18] Cf. Fedwick, "Abbreviations: 1. The Works of Basil of Caesarea" in *idem*, ed., *Basil of Caesarea* 1. xxx and R. Pouchet, *Basile* 29.

[19] I use the Greek text of the Basilian letters established by Yves Courtonne in Basil, *Lettres*, 3 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957-1966).

[20] Courtonne 1.37-40.

[21] R. Pouchet, *Basile* 117 ff.; P. Fedwick, "Chronology" 7, n. 24. The fact that *Ep.* 9 whispers no word about *CEun* has made Pouchet conclude that the former was written before the latter (see his *Basile* 119).

[22] Basil, *Briefe* 1.169, n. 76.

[23] Cf. Pouchet, *Basile* 118.

ὑποστάσεων), but also a difference in substance (οὐσίας διαφοράν), a diminution in power and a variation of glory" (*Ep.* 9,2.16-21). Therefore, he had an unconstant attitude vis-à-vis the *homoousios*. Basil's own position in regard to the *homoousios* is of extreme importance: it is in the third section of this letter that he seems to have decided between the use of "unchangeably like in substance" (ἀπαραλλάκτως ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν) and "consubstantial" (τὸ ὁμοούσιον). He sees a danger in the use of the former, because, if separated from "unchangeably," the "like in substance" can diminish the glory of the Son, thus subordinating him (*Ep.* 9,3.11-14).

The synod held at Constantinople in January 360, alluded to by Basil in *Ep.* 9,3.12-13, did even more than that: it subordinated the Son by using the ὅμοιος in regard to him and by banning the use of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις as non-biblical.[24] Moreover, as R. Hübner has rightly noted, in *Ep.* 9,2, as well as in *Ep.* 52,3.2, Basil regards the *homoousios* as a protection against an identity of the persons in the Sabellian sense.[25] Therefore, in the end, Basil opts for *homoousios* as being "less open to fraud" (*Ep.* 9,3.16-18). Not the same was the case in his *Ep.* 361 (if this is his!) to Apollinarius, dated to 362(?) by Hauschild, where Basil explicitly preferred "unchangeably like" (ἀπαραλλάκτως ὁμοίου) to *homoousios*.[26] The decision he made in *Ep.* 9 was really significant to Basil, since, let us remember, he first appeared in a group that did not accept the *homoousios*.[27] Nevertheless, Basil does not intransigently reject the use of "unchangeably like in substance," for he is mindful of his irenic mission among the various ecclesiastical parties of that time. In addition, as Fedwick showed, Basil did not understand the unity of faith and proclamation of the Church in a narrow sense.[28]

Ep. 9 depicts a Basil who is aware of the importance of maintaining the distinction of the persons in the Godhead, as well as of the importance of *homoousios*. In *CEun*, as shown, only in the end ὑπόστασις came to mean "person." Here, he explicitly says against Sabellius that the divine persons should be distinguished. Therefore, I am reluctant to date *Ep.* 9 too early

---

[24] Cf. J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* 293 f.

[25] Reinhard M. Hübner, "Basilius von Caesarea und das *homoousios*" in *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity. Essays in Tribute to G.C. Stead*, ed. Lionel R. Wickham *et al.* (Leiden: Brill, 1993) 77, n. 34.

[26] Courtonne 3.221.

[27] See J. Gribomont, "Intransigence and Irenicism" 116.

[28] Paul J. Fedwick. *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979) 73 f.

before the *CEun*, preferring to stick to the date indicated by Hauschild, summer(?) of 364. It is strange, however, that Basil does not make any reference to *CEun* in this letter.

EPISTLE 125.[29] The next letter I analyze is a confession of faith dictated by Basil and signed by Eustathius of Sebaste. *Ep.* 125 was written in August 373, according to Fedwick and Hauschild, or maybe in June 373, according to Pouchet.[30] Another epistle, *Ep.* 99,[31] describes Basil's attempts to convince Eustathius of Sebaste to sign this confession of orthodox faith, since the latter was suspicious of Pneumatomachianism in the eyes of his suffragan bishop, Theodotus of Nicopolis.[32] Basil, a close friend and former disciple of Eustathius of Sebaste, tried to clear this old ascetic of the charges of heresy brought against him and to reconcile him with Theodotus. Theodotus extended the suspicion of heresy over Basil, too. So, this confession of faith was also an opportunity for the latter to display his own orthodoxy. Eventually, as *Ep.* 99 shows, Eustathius signed the confession of faith proposed by Basil, despite Theodotus of Nicopolis' affirmation to the contrary. Nevertheless, Eustathius' inconstancy of faith and opportunism were well-known, so his adherence to Basil's confession of faith was ephemeral. Besides Eustathius' opportunism, Pouchet suggests two other reasons for his repudiation of this confession of faith. They are the following: the appointment by Basil of the priest Poimenius of Caesarea to the episcopal see of Satala which was under the jurisdiction of Eustathius; the doctrinal radicalism of the members of Eustathius' entourage.[33] Therefore, it would be no wonder if both Basil and Theodotus were right in their accounts, despite their being contradictory. In his *De Spiritu Sancto*, Hermann Dörries reconstructed the relations between Basil and Eustathius and showed also that the latter indeed repudiated this confession of faith.[34] Accordingly, Basil's attempt at reconciliation between Eustathius and Theodotus was not only unsuccessful, but led to a rupture between Basil himself and Eustathius.

---

[29] Courtonne 2.30-34.

[30] Fedwick, "Chronology" 16; Hauschild in Basil, *Briefe* 1.240; Pouchet, *Basile* 280.

[31] Courtonne 1.214-18.

[32] Cf. also *Epp.* 224,3.1-15; 244,2.13-21. Cf. Gribomont, "Intransigence and Irenicism" 127.

[33] For an account of Eustathius of Sebaste's inconstancy of faith see Pouchet, *Basile* 287 ff., 403 f.

[34] Hermann Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto: Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluß der trinitarischen Dogmas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956) 28-43.

Ep. 125 contains eight occurrences of the term ὑπόστασις, all of which are in trinitarian contexts. As in the previous letter analyzed, the other term of interest for this article, πρόσωπον, does not appear at all. This can indicate a certain low significance πρόσωπον has for trinitarian theology in Basil's opinion. Besides, *Ep.* 125 is paramount for Basil's own confession of faith, because it shows his increasing attachment to the Nicene creed. The entire second section of this letter is occupied by the text of the Nicene creed.

Ep. 125 opens by a reference to the creed drawn up by the "blessed Fathers" at Nicaea. Those who wish to be received into communion with the orthodox should be required to profess the Nicene creed as a sufficient proof of their new commitment. Nonetheless, Basil warns that even among those who profess this faith there are some who misinterpret certain words of the creed. He gives the examples of Marcellus of Ancyra and the fourth-century Sabellians who misinterpreted the *homoousios* and the Nicene anathema, "If anyone says that the Son is of another substance or ὑπόστασις (ἐξ ἑτέρας οὐσίας ἢ ὑποστάσεως), the catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes him."[35] Basil says that Marcellus, "in his impiety against the ὑπόστασις of the Lord (εἰς τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ Κυρίου) and explaining him as a mere 'word'," alleged to have inferred this from the "consubstantial" (*Ep.* 125,1.22-25). The "Sabellians" whom Basil envisages in the same letter seem to be the Eustathians, partisans and followers of Eustathius of Antioch, whose slogan after Nicaea was "μία ὑπόστασις" of the Godhead.[36] They understood, wrongly according to Basil, that "ὑπόστασις and substance are the same thing (ὑπόστασιν καὶ οὐσίαν ταὐτόν)" (*Ep.* 125,1.26-29). "For," continues Basil, "it is not said therein [in the Nicene anathema quoted above] that substance and ὑπόστασις are the same" (*Ep.* 125,1.32). This makes him argue that, in fact, the Nicene Fathers understood ὑπόστασις as distinct from οὐσία. Basil's argument is the following:

> If the words revealed one and the same meaning, what was the need of each separately? But it is evident that, since some denied that the Son is of the substance (οὐσία) of the Father, and others said that he was not of the substance but of some other ὑπόστασις, thus they condemned both positions as foreign to the opinion of the Church. For, when they came to revealing their opinion, they said that the Son was of the substance (οὐσία) of the Father,

---

[35] See *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner, 1 (London: Shed & Ward, 1990) 5.

[36] Cf. R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988) 213 ff.

> not going on to add "of the ὑπόστασις" (ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως). Thus the former statement is laid down as a rejection of faulty opinion, while the latter contains the declaration of the doctrine of salvation. It is necessary, therefore, to confess the Son as of the same substance as the Father (ὁμοούσιον τὸν Υἱὸν τῷ Πατρί), as it is written, and to confess the Father in his own proper person (ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει), and the Son in his own, and the Holy Spirit in his own, according as the Fathers themselves have clearly set forth. For sufficiently and clearly have they shown this when they said, "Light of Light," that the one is who begot and the other who was begotten. Yet Light and Light, so that the notion of the substance is one and the same. (*Ep.* 125,1.32-49)[37]

The interpretation of the Nicene use of ὑπόστασις provided by Basil is not easy to support, because the text of the anathema is rather ambiguous.[38] First of all, Basil overlooks the fact that ὑπόστασις was considered by many as synonymous with οὐσία at least until the synod held in 362 at Alexandria, and this synonymy caused endless trouble. For example, Alexander himself, bishop of Alexandria, in whose time the synod of Nicaea took place in 325, preferred ὑπόστασις or φύσις often in contexts where οὐσία would have been possible.[39] The synonymy was due to the meaning of ὑφεστάναι (= to lie under) which made ὑπόστασις an equivalent of "substratum" and consequently of οὐσία. Origen tried to distinguish these terms in *ComJn* I,24.151-2; II,10.75-76 and *CCels* VIII,12,[40] but his opinion was not influential.

Second, as I already pointed out, in *CEun* 1,20.11 Basil himself takes advantage of the synonymy of the two words in order to affirm the consubstantiality of God the Father with his Son. Third, Basil says that οὐσία

---

[37] I used Deferrari's translation slightly altered (Saint Basil, *The Letters* 1 [London: Heinemann, 1926]).

[38] H. Dörrie said that Nicaea condemned explicitly the Arian teaching of different "hypostases" in God (see his "Ὑπόστασις: Wort- und Bedeutungsgeschichte" in *idem, Platonica Minora* [München: W. Fink, 1976] 55). For a nuanced discussion of the Nicene anathema see Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) 233-245.

[39] Apud Stead, *Divine Substance* 225.

[40] See Origen, *Commentaire sur Saint Jean*, vol. 1 (books 1-5), ed. Cécile Blanc, SC 120 (Paris: Cerf, 1966) 136-9 and 254-8; *idem, Contre Celse*, vol. 4 (books 7-8), ed. Marcel Borret, SC 150 (Paris: Cerf, 1969) 198-201. In his "Der trinitarische Gebrauch des Hypostasisbegriffs bei Origenes" (*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 34 (1991) 12-20), Jürgen Hammerstaedt argues that the meaning of ὑπόστασις as used by Origen is different from the meaning imposed by the Cappadocians. I am inclined to disagree with Hammerstaedt. I do acknowledge that in numerous Origenian texts ὑπόστασις is the exact equivalent of οὐσία; but this equivalence does not prevent the existence of the particular passages just indicated, in which Origen uses the two terms with different meanings. It is perhaps the scantiness of the latter that makes them more obvious.

is said about the Son's common substance with the Father, whereas ὑπόστασις allegedly expresses the doctrine of salvation. In other words, the former refers to the *theologia*, whereas the latter to the *oikonomia*. Yet the context in which the Nicene Fathers anathematize whomever discriminates between the Son's and Father's οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, thus making the two words synonyms, is not an economic one as Basil insinuates. The *Nicaenum* deals here with the Son's generation from the Father and his immutability, as well as with the saying "there was a time when he was not"; no mention of the Son's incarnation is made in this particular passage.

Fourth, there was a certain tradition, however, that might have left room for the interpretation embraced by Basil. This tradition went back to Eusebius of Caesarea who, in writing to his diocese to justify his subscription to the *Nicaenum*, explained that the Son "is not from some other ὑπόστασις or substance, but from the Father" (μὴ ἐξ ἑτέρας τινὸς ὑποστάσεως τε καὶ οὐσίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ πατρός).[41] This interpretation indeed allows for the conclusion that the Son is another person (or hypostasis) than the Father, "so that there are two, and indeed three, divine hypostases."[42] Fifth, Basil might also have read the famous letter of Athanasius of Alexandria, known as the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (the synodal letter of the council held in 362 in Alexandria),[43] where a distinction is made between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις.

Even if Basil's interpretation of the Nicene ὑπόστασις in this epistle is forced, the epistle itself brandishes two things: 1) that Basil views the *Nicaenum* as the canon of orthodoxy and 2) that he is deeply convinced that the distinctions among the divine persons (ὑποστάσεις) should be emphasized. Moreover, in the third part of *Ep.* 125 Basil affirms categorically the divinity of the Holy Spirit. He says that all those should be anathematized who call the Holy Spirit a creature and those who will not confess that he is holy by nature, as the Father and the Son are holy by nature, but deprive him of his divine and blessed nature (*Ep.* 125,3.16-21).[44]

---

[41] Greek text in Opitz, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites* 22; apud Stead, *Divine Substance* 239.

[42] Stead, *Divine Substance* 240.

[43] For the text of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, see J. Stevenson, ed., *Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church A.D. 337-461*, edition revised by W.H.C. Frend (London: SPCK, 1989) 80-83.

[44] Cf. also *Ep.* 52,4.1-2 (Courtonne 1.130); *Ep.* 90,2.22-24 (Courtonne 1.196).

EPISTLE 52.[45] Dated by Pouchet to probably the beginning of 373, by Hauschild to probably 375/376 and by Fedwick who follows Dörries to the fall of 376,[46] this letter was addressed to some *canonicae*, that is, women enrolled to devote themselves to works of charity. *Ep.* 52 is quite similar in content and structure to *Ep.* 125: the first three sections explain the "consubstantial" along almost the same lines as the previous letter, whereas the fourth underscores the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Hence one can infer either that both were written around the same date or that Basil might have recalled the arguments of *Ep.* 125 when he wrote *Ep.* 52 one or two years later.

In *Ep.* 52 Basil introduces a theoretical explanation of the term "consubstantial" which, in my view, seems to be more nuanced than the explanation given in the previous letter. He says: "For nothing is of the same substance (consubstantial) with itself, but one thing is [consubstantial] with another thing" (*Ep.* 52,3.3-4). Now one can more easily understand why Basil insists that the "consubstantial" presupposes at least two different things, or persons in the case of Nicaea, of which the consubstantiality should be predicated. To this he adds that the *homoousios* "sets aright the error of Sabellius; for it does away with the identity of ὑπόστασις (ἀναιρεῖ γὰρ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς ὑποστάσεως) and introduces a perfect notion of the persons (τελείαν τῶν προσώπων τὴν ἔννοιαν) [in the Godhead], . . . because it marks out the property of the persons (τῶν ὑποστάσεων τὴν ἰδιότητα) and at the same time sets forth the indistinguishableness of their nature" (*Ep.* 52,3.1-6). Some clarifications are necessary at this point. When first using ὑπόστασις in this passage, Basil thinks of the Sabellian notion of ὑπόστασις: Sabellius understood God as one and the same ὑπόστασις (substance) manifesting itself at times under different πρόσωπα ("masks" or "faces"). Basil says that, by warranting that nothing can be consubstantial with itself, the term "consubstantial" does away with this Sabellian confusion. The second time, Basil uses ὑπόστασις with the usual meaning he attributes to it in this period, i.e., "divine person." The phrase "a perfect notion of the persons [in the Godhead]" is also worth analysis: the presence of the adjective "perfect" (τέλεια) indicates that the term πρόσωπον alone is not sufficient to designate the divine persons. To Basil, the term πρόσωπον is rather weak and definitely has Sabellian overtones; therefore, to it Basil prefers ὑπόστασις.

---

[45] Courtonne 1.133-37.

[46] Fedwick, "Chronology" 17; Hauschild in Basil, *Briefe* 1.196; Pouchet, *Basile* 339.

In order for it to become fitting to express the divine persons, πρόσωπον should be undergirded by the adjective "perfect."[47]

EPISTLE 236.[48] Basil addressed this letter to his favorite spiritual son, bishop Amphilochius of Iconium, as part of an *aide-mémoire* meant to help the latter to cope with the attacks of the Eunomians. The five letters of the package known as the ὑπομνηστικός (*Ep.* 234 – *Ep.* 236) were sent to Amphilochius at the beginning of A.D. 376, according to Fedwick and Pouchet.[49] Hauschild dates *Ep.* 232 and 236 to A.D. 375, whereas for the remainder he hesitates between the beginning of 375 and 376.[50]

In this epistle Basil answers various questions asked by Amphilochius: the issue raised by the Anomoeans that Jesus Christ does not know the day and the hour of the end, the issue raised by the Encratites of the foods that are good to eat, the issue of the human affairs being managed according to fate, etc. The entire sixth section is devoted to explaining the difference between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. Robert Pouchet says that, after the death of his brother Basil and inspired by *Ep.* 236,6, Gregory of Nyssa composed an ampler dissertation on the same topic, the famous *Ep.* 38 in the Basilian corpus.[51]

Before the sixth section of *Ep.* 236 the word πρόσωπον occurs twice. It can be translated by "person" in the largest sense or by "individual," but Basil does not attach to it any other special significance, be it trinitarian or anthropological, since the context deals with the Anomoean accusation mentioned above. *Ep.* 236,1.18-20 reads: "The term 'no one' seems to be a universal expression, so that not even one person (μηδὲ ἓν πρόσωπον) is excluded by this word." The next occurrence refers to the person of the Lord, in a context where Basil compares two versions (Matthew's and Mark's) of the account where the Lord is said to know not the day and the hour of the end. The text reads: "Therefore, passing over his [Lord's] own person (τὸ ἑαυτοῦ πρόσωπον) in the reading from Matthew, taken for granted, as the Lord said that the angels were in ignorance, but that the Father alone knew, saying by his silence that the knowledge of the Father was also his own . . ." (*Ep.* 236,2.17-21).

---

[47] Cf. also below *Ep.* 210,3.15; *Ep.* 214,3.21; *Ep.* 214,4.15.

[48] Courtonne 3.47-55.

[49] Fedwick, "Chronology" 17; Pouchet, *Basile* 353.

[50] Basil, *Briefe* 3.282.

[51] Pouchet, *Basile* 60.

The sixth section of this letter is very important for the scope of this article, because, as I said, it defines the distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. The text reads:

> Οὐσία and ὑπόστασις have the distinction that the common has with reference to the particular (τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον); for example, just as "an animal" (ζῷον) has with reference to "a particular human" (δεῖνα ἄνθρωπον). For this reason we confess one substance (οὐσία) for the Godhead, so as not to hand down variously the notion of the being; but we confess that the ὑπόστασις is particular, in order that our conception of Father and Son and Holy Spirit may be unconfused and plain. For unless we think of the characteristics that are sharply defined in the case of each, as for example fatherhood and sonship and holiness (πατρότητα, υἱότητα καὶ ἁγιασμόν), but from the general notion of being confess God, it is impossible to hand down a sound definition of faith. Therefore, we must add what is particular to what is common and thus confess the faith; the Godhead is something common, the paternity something particular, and combining these we should say: "I believe in God the Father." And again in the confession of the Son we should do likewise—combine the particular with the common and say: "I believe in God the Son." Similarly too in the case of the Holy Spirit, we should frame on the same principle our utterance of the reference to him and say: "I believe also in the divine Holy Spirit,"[52] so that throughout the whole, both unity is preserved in the confession of the one Godhead, and that which is peculiar to the persons (τὸ τῶν προσώπων ἰδιάζον) is confessed in the distinction made in the characteristics attributed to each. (*Ep.* 236,6.1-22)

This text shows more clearly than the previous letters that Basil has come to a solid understanding of the notions he uses. Ὑπόστασις is now understood as a particular way of existence. Πρόσωπον, as used at the end of the passage, seems to be synonym with ὑπόστασις. Nonetheless, in the very next paragraph (*Ep.* 236,6.22-28), which I have not quoted because of its length, Basil insists that πρόσωπον is redolent of Sabellianism. Consequently, he avoids using it as a technical term to designate the divine persons. In Basil's view the phrase τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις is an excellent protection against Sabellianism (cf. *Ep.* 236,6.34). *Ep.* 236,6 constitutes a reference to the trinitarian formula that Basil, more than any other, has established and imposed: one substance, three persons. This text also displays Basil's awareness that the trinitarian dogma is paramount for the sound, orthodox faith.

In his book *Amphilochius von Ikonium*, Karl Holl says that the examples Basil uses in *Ep.* 236,6 and *CEun* 2,4 indicate an underdevelopment of both terminology and conception, because the Aristotelian categories of the

---

[52] Note Basil's reluctance to say "God the Holy Spirit."

"common" (or "generic") and the "particular" can be applied to things, but are not fully adequate to express something personal. Although quoting a text such as *De Spiritu Sancto* 17,41-43, Holl still remains unconvinced that Basil's arguments are satisfactory.[53] In *De Spiritu Sancto* 17,41-43 Basil dismisses the idea that the distinction between the Godhead and the persons is that between an abstract essence, such as humanity, and its concrete manifestations, such as man, so that the Holy Spirit could be regarded as a sub-class within the Godhead. Because of this text in Basil and other similar texts in the two Gregorys, R.P.C. Hanson says that "it is dangerous to argue confidently" that any of the Cappadocian Fathers is the exponent of the so-called "generic" theory, that assumes a generic understanding of the divine substance in contradistinction to an individual understanding of the divine persons, since they themselves did not put too much trust in analogies.[54] A supplementary proof in favor of Hanson's opinion is the fact that the analogy of the "generic" and the "particular" is not the only analogy the Cappadocians use to argue for one substance and three persons in God. They use many other analogies in order to express the Holy Trinity but are well aware that none of them can fully communicate the ineffable divine mystery.

Holl also detects a conflict in Basil's argumentation, and this time I tend to agree with him, although with the aforementioned provision about analogies: on the one hand, Basil tries to name what differentiates (γνωρίσματα) the divine persons from each other; on the other hand, names such as "fatherhood" and "sonship" are relational names in Basil's view, thus indicating the relation that exists between the persons, i.e., the κοινωνία.[55] Albeit Holl construes on *Ep.* 38 (attributed to Gregory of Nyssa today), his theory, I think, holds true for Basil's *Ep.* 236 as well. Holl thinks that this and other inconsistencies blur the sharp distinction Basil wanted to maintain between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις.[56]

EPISTLE 210.[57] This letter is the third piece of the trilogy formed by epistles 204, 207 and 210, all of which were addressed to the Neocaesareans.

---

[53] Karl Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den großen Kappadoziern* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1904) 133 f. H. Dörries agrees with Holl (*De Spiritu Sancto* 138-9, n. 3).

[54] Hanson, *Search* 698, 734-737.

[55] Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium* 147.

[56] *Ibid.*, 152.

[57] Courtonne 2.189-197.

Each epistle, however, has a different addressee: the first is addressed to the *presbyterium* of Neocaesarea, the second to all clergy, and the third to the learned lay persons of the city. It seems that at the suggestion of Olympius (cf. *Ep.* 211) and in response to the "calumnies" launched against him by the bishop of Neocaesarea, Atarbius, Basil decided, before the fall of 376, to re-establish relations with this Church somehow over its bishop's head.[58] These letters bear testimony to Basil's adhesion to the Nicene faith. Fedwick, Pouchet and Hauschild agree to date *Ep.* 210 to the summer of A.D. 376.[59]

Ep. 207 ends up with some serious caveats addressed to the clergy of Neocaesarea: "Only let important things prevail, and silence innovations in faith. Do not reject the persons (ὑποστάσεις). Do not deny the name of Christ. Do not misinterpret the words of Gregory [Thaumaturgus]. Otherwise, as long as we breathe and can speak, we cannot be silent before so great a danger to souls (*Ep.* 207,4.37-42)."[60] One can see that, among others, the issue of the three persons in the Godhead had become a touchstone of orthodoxy for Basil. Basil suspected bishop Atarbius of Neocaesarea himself of Sabellianism. *Ep.* 210 is directed mostly against the latter's larval Sabellianism. In the third section of this letter Basil equates Sabellianism with Judaism (3.13), because both reduce the Father, Son and Holy Spirit to only one ὑπόστασις, by not recognizing the peculiarity of the persons (τὸ ἰδιάζον τῶν ὑποστάσεων). Like Judaism, Sabellianism denies the existence of the Son and of the Spirit: "For he who calls Father, Son, and Holy Spirit one thing under many faces (ἓν πρᾶγμα πολυπρόσωπον), and makes one ὑπόστασις out of three, what else does he do but deny the existence from the eternity of the Only-begotten?" (*Ep.* 210,3.15-18). At the other extreme are those who, albeit acknowledging three ὑποστάσεις in God, do not confess their community of substance (τὸ κοίνον τῆς οὐσίας), thus falling into polytheism (*Ep.* 210,5.25-27).

At that time all parties were trying to use various formulas, biblical or preserved by the Tradition of the Church, to buttress their own—many times contradictory—doctrines.[61] This was the case with the baptismal formula that reads: "Teach you all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Mt. 28:19). Because

---

[58] Pouchet, *Basile* 344, 479.

[59] Fedwick, "Chronology" 17; Pouchet, *Basile* 344; Hauschild in Basil, *Briefe* 1.244.

[60] Courtonne 2.188.

[61] Cf. Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium* 118, 125 f., 129 f. On Basil's use of Tradition, see P. Fedwick, *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership* 93 f.

of the phrase "in the name," not "in the names," the Sabellians tried to use the baptismal formula to support their doctrine that there is only one ὑπόστασις in God, whereas Basil has said that the phrase refers to the divine nature that is common to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit (*Ep.* 210,3.27-4.30).

The term πρόσωπον was suspect of Sabellianism in Basil's view. In *Ep.* 210 he makes this opinion even more clear: Sabellius himself spoke of "persons" (πρόσωπα) in God, but these "persons" did not constitute realities, but mere fictions. Therefore, I think, one can safely translate the Sabellian πρόσωπα by "masks" or "faces." Basil says:

> For it is not sufficient to enumerate the difference of the persons (διαφορὰς προσώπων), but it is necessary to confess that each person exists in a true subsistence (ἕκαστον πρόσωπον ἐν ὑποστάσει ἀληθινῇ ὑπάρχον). For not even Sabellius rejected this non-subsistent representation of the persons (ἀνυπόστατον τῶν προσώπων ἀναπλασμόν), saying that the same God, though one in substance, is transformed on every occasion according to necessary circumstances, and is spoken of now as Father, and now as Son, and now as Holy Spirit" (*Ep.* 210,5.34-41).

It thus becomes intelligible that if one wants to call the Father, Son or Holy Spirit πρόσωπα, one has to add immediately the phrase "existing in true subsistences,"[62] lest one falls into the error of Sabellius. Basil is using here an old meaning of ὑπόστασις, that of "subsistence," since it seems to support his argument against Sabellius.

EPISTLE 214.[63] Although having a different addressee than the previous epistle, namely, Count Terentius, *Ep.* 214 is very similar to *Ep.* 210 inasmuch as the doctrinal content is concerned. While Fedwick and Pouchet agree that it was written in late summer or early fall of A.D. 376, Hauschild places it in September/October 376.[64] Around 375 Terentius had been appointed as interim count of the Orient, that is, auxiliary of the prefect Modestus for the civil diocese of the Orient. Yet there was a schism at that time in the capital of the Orient, Antioch. The city was divided among three Nicene parties: the majority led by the priest Flavian during the exile of his bishop Meletius, the minority conducted by the bishop Paulinus, and the small Appolinarian community led by Vitalis.[65] Basil was in communion

---

[62] Or one can add "perfect" (cf. *Ep.* 125,3.1-6 discussed above).

[63] Courtonne 2.202-206.

[64] Fedwick, "Chronology" 17; Pouchet, *Basile* 537; Hauschild in Basil, *Briefe* 3.281.

[65] See A. de Halleux, "'Hypostase' et 'personne'" 316-17. For an overview of the

with Meletius who had a Homoean past,[66] whereas the Westerners with Paulinus. Once Terentius arrived in Antioch bishop Paulinus and his partisans tried to gain him over to their cause. But Basil considered that Paulinus was wrong in matters of faith.[67] Accordingly, he decided to write to Terentius in order to persuade him of Paulinus' mistakes and at the same time to recommend bishop Meletius to him, as "the man of God" and the one who should be the legitimate bishop of Antioch. *Ep.* 214 is a brief exposition of the trinitarian controversy meant to convince Terentius that Paulinus was on the Sabellian side.

In the third section of *Ep.* 214, Basil reports that the Arians (perhaps the Eunomians) accuse him of having said that the Son is "consubstantial according to the ὑπόστασις" (*Ep.* 214,3.7). He denies it, because, in his view, this would lead to the affirmation that there is only one ὑπόστασις (meaning "person" this time) in the Godhead, that is to Sabellianism. It is precisely against Sabellianism that Basil fought so fiercely, as we have seen. His argument about Sabellianism is identical to that in *Ep.* 210,5.34-41, quoted above; so, I do not repeat it. Basil also rejects as dangerous Paulinus' formula, one substratum (ἓν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ) and three perfect persons (τρία πρόσωπα τέλεια), because the term πρόσωπον was used before by Sabellius (*Ep.* 214,3.29 ff.). Nevertheless, as A. de Halleux has remarked,[68] Basil is very cautious when accusing Paulinus, because he knows that Terentius would show his epistle to the latter. Accordingly, he uses two levels of the discourse indicated by the verbs "to say" and "to confess."[69] Basil's complete text reads:

> If then, among us[70] also, some say (λέγοντες) overtly that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one in substratum (ἓν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ), while at the same time confessing (ὁμολογοῦντες) three perfect persons (τρία πρόσωπα τέλεια), how do they not appear to offer clear and incontestable proof that the things said of us are true? (*Ep.* 214,3.29-33).

Since πρόσωπον was used by Sabellius (*Ep.* 214,3.14 ff.), the conclusion that Basil tries to foist on Terentius is that Paulinus' formula camouflages

---

intricate relations between East and West in the period from 371 to 377, see Fedwick, *Church and Charisma* 107-113 and Hanson, *Search* 797-802.

[66] Hanson, *Search* 652.

[67] See *Ep.* 216 (Courtonne 2.207-8) for a good introduction to *Ep.* 214.

[68] A. de Halleux, "'Hypostase' et 'personne'" 326-328.

[69] *Ibid.*, 327.

[70] "Among us" suggests the idea that Basil accepts Paulinus on the same anti-Arian side with him.

Sabellianism. Yet Paulinus' formula contained the adjective "perfect," which was meant to prevent any accusation of Sabellianism. As I showed in the analysis of *Ep.* 52,3.2, Basil himself admitted the phrase "perfect persons" (πρόσωπα τέλεια) as quite properly expressing the divine persons, although he eventually preferred the term ὑπόστασις instead of πρόσωπον. So, his argumentation against Paulinus seems to have certain political connotations also, especially since Basil wanted Meletius on the episcopal chair of Antioch. Yet it would be a mistake to reduce *Ep.* 214 to a mere political manoeuvre. After 372 Basil had become increasingly aware that the formula μία οὐσία, τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις was the best protection against both Arianism and Sabellianism, as well as against Pneumatomachianism. Therefore, he encouraged its use at the expense of other formulas which might cause misinterpretations.

In the next section, Basil explains to Terentius the difference between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. He repeats the analogy between "the common" (τὸ κοινόν) and "the particular" (τὸ ἴδιον) presented extensively in *Ep.* 236,6 to Amphilochius of Iconium. Yet what is interesting here is the new argument Basil mentions: "the brethren of the West" themselves recognize that οὐσία and ὑπόστασις are not the same thing. In doing so, they acknowledge the insufficience of the Latin and simply transliterate the Greek term as *usia* (*Ep.* 236,4.1-5), instead of using its Latin equivalent *substantia.*

Basil explains to Terentius the distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις in order to make him understand that Paulinus should use ὑποστάσεις to refer to the divine persons. Moreover, Basil contends that it is not sufficient for Paulinus and his followers to recognize that the persons are in a true subsistence (ἐν ὑποστάσει αὐτὰ εἶναι ἀληθινῇ); they should also "count" (καὶ ἀριθμείτωσαν) or express this belief in numbers, so that both the consubstantial and the three divine, perfect and complete, persons be proclaimed (*Ep.* 214,4.16-22).[71] It is the same insistence encountered in his previous letters concerning the importance of three ὑποστάσεις. Paulinus did not want to use "three ὑποστάσεις," because he had stuck to the Nicene formula according to which οὐσία and ὑπόστασις were synonyms. In fact, as I proved, Basil tried to interpret the two terms in the Nicene creed as if they were not synonyms; but his interpretation was forced.

---

[71] In explaining this passage, K. Holl simply adheres to the theory of the *Jungnizänismus* as exposed by Th. Zahn which has been discredited today (see Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium* 144 ff., and esp. 145, n. 1).

When requesting that Paulinus and his followers "count" the ὑποστάσεις, Basil has in mind what has been recently termed as the concept of "enumeration of hypostases." According to him (*Ep.* 210,5.31-36),[72] unlike their common substance, persons (ὑποστάσεις) are enumerative entities. But Basil insists that the divine persons have to be "enumerated piously" (εὐσεβῶς ἀριθμεῖν) not materially and adds that divinity is above number.[73] An Italian scholar, Marina Troiano, traces the concept of "enumeration of hypostases" back to Aristotle's *Met.* Λ,8,31-38.[74]

Conclusions

To sum up, one can say that in his earlier writings Basil was not overtly concerned with the meanings of the terms πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις for the faith. Yet, as he became increasingly involved in the doctrinal fights against various heretics and especially after being appointed a bishop, Basil felt responsible for the cultivation and preservation of the orthodox faith. In his early years he used πρόσωπον with the sense of "face," "mouth," "character in a play," or even "person" in the largest sense as opposed to "thing" (πράγμα). Later, he became aware that πρόσωπον was a term compromised by Sabellius when the latter used it with the meaning of "mask" devoid of any subsistence in regard to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. So, when using πρόσωπον, Basil asked for its qualification with "perfect" or "existing in a true subsistence." Nevertheless, despite these qualifications, he strongly discouraged the use of πρόσωπον as a technical term to refer to the divine persons.

Concerning ὑπόστασις, a development in its use can also be noted. In *CEun* it could mean "substance" (synonymous with οὐσία), "subsistence," "substratum," or even "person." Later, Basil began to distinguish it from "substance" so much so as to force the interpretation in this direction of the Nicene anathema that condemned those who would discriminate between ὑπόστασις and οὐσία. A little later (ca. 375-6), besides the *Nicaeanum*, the confession of three persons and one substance in God became a touch-

---

[72] Courtonne 2.195-6. Cf. also Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium Quod non sint tres dei* 40.24 ff.; 53.12-15, ed. F. Müller (GNO 3/1, Leiden: Brill, 1958).

[73] *De Spiritu Sancto* 18,44.1-23 (ed. Pruche 402-4, SC 17 bis). Cf. Andrea Milano, *Persona in teologia* (Naples: Dehoniane, 1984) 149-151.

[74] Marina Silvia Troiano, "Il concetto di numerazione delle ipostasi in Basilio di Cesarea," *Vetera Christianorum* 24 (1987) 350 f.

stone of orthodoxy to him. Nonetheless, the conclusions reached in this article about ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον need to be tested against other works by the same author, such as *De Spiritu Sancto*, the *Homilies on the Hexaemeron* to see if they can be generalized.[75]

1812-35 Charles Street West, *Toronto*, ON, M4Y 1R6, Canada

[75] I should like to offer my gratitude for criticisms and suggestions made by Professors Michel R. Barnes, Paul J. Fedwick and John M. Rist, as well as by my wife, Lavinia Stan. A special thank-you also goes to an anonymous *VC* reader.

THE PRACTICE AND PROHIBITION OF SELF-CASTRATION IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

BY

DANIEL F. CANER

1. *Opposing Attitudes towards Self-Castration as an Expression of Continence: Justin Martyr and Basil of Ancyra*

In his *Apology* Justin Martyr tells how a young man in Alexandria petitioned the Roman prefect for permission to be castrated.[1] Permission was denied, but Justin's apologetical use and evident approval of the effort itself are striking.[2] The youth intended, so Justin writes, to persuade non-Christians that sexual promiscuity was not a μυστήριον, or secret rite, among Christians, and he cites the incident to demonstrate that some Christians forgo marriage altogether and live completely in continence.

Written in the middle of the second century c.e., this is the earliest documentation of the impulse exhibited by certain early Christians towards self-castration as an expression of Christian chastity. Two centuries later Basil of Ancyra devoted several sections of his treatise *On the True Integrity of Virginity* (ca. 336-58) to the same practice. Unlike Justin, however, Basil hardly considers this evidence of a man's continence: on the contrary, those who "perversely" castrate themselves "by this very deed make a declaration of their own licentiousness (ἀκολασία)."[3] Our modern sensibilities may require no explanation for the shift from approval to disapproval of self-castration these two authors illustrate. Yet their testimony provokes basic

---

[1] *Apol.* 29,1-2, ed. E. Goodspeed, in *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen 1914) 45: 'Αλλ' ἡ τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἐγαμοῦμεν, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ παίδων ἀνατροφῇ, ἢ παραιτούμενοι τὸ γήμασθαι τέλεον ἐνεκρατευόμεθα. Καὶ ἤδη τις τῶν ἡμετέρων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ πεῖσαι ὑμᾶς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν μυστήριον ἡ ἀνέδην μίξις, βιβλίδιον ἀνέδωκεν ἐν 'Αλεξανδρείᾳ Φήλικι ἡγεμονεύοντι, ἀξιῶν ἐπιτρέψαι ἰατρῷ τοὺς διδύμους αὐτοῦ ἀφελεῖν. Felix's prefecture has been dated ca. 150-153.

[2] H. Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus* (Texts and Studies 5; Cambridge 1959) 110.

[3] *De virg.* 61 (PG 30, 793A): ἑαυτοὺς ἀτόπως ἠκρωτηρίασαν, αὐτῷ τῷ ἔργῳ ἀκολασίαν ἑαυτῶν μακρόθεν κατηγοροῦντες.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

questions: Why did Basil consider it such a matter of concern, both in general and for the readers of his treatise in particular? or more simply, What appeal was there for Justin's youth and other Christians in such a dramatic act as self-castration?

The practice and prohibition of self-castration in early Christianity has only received passing historical notice in conjunction with studies of the interpretation of Matthew 19:12[4] or the debate over Origen's alleged self-castration.[5] These studies, like the orthodox treatises from which the evidence must be drawn, tend to marginalize self-castration as a rare act on the "lunatic fringe"[6] of early Christian asceticism. Their view needs modification. Though testimony is scanty, sources from the fourth century indicate that by then self-castration had become a real problem in the nascent Church. Basil, for example, excuses his discussion of it by asserting a need to "check the many such eunuchs" who had "already grown prominent in the Church."[7] A more general concern appears in the *Nicaean Canons* and the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions* which contain statutes against self-made eunuchs both among the laity and the clergy.[8] The authors of these canons perceived self-castration as an indication of certain Christian teachings they deemed heretical. Yet the subsequent dismissal of the act by both ancient and modern authorities as merely an extreme expression of heretical perversity[9] does little to further our understanding of the actual concerns and motives of Christians who chose to do it. This paper argues instead that self-castration should be viewed more generally as a practice of early Christians who, prompted by their understanding of Matthew 19:12 and

---

[4] E.g., W. Baur, "Matth. 19,12 und die alten Christen," in *Neutestamentliche Studien. Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*, ed. H. Windisch (Leipzig 1914) 235-44; G. Caspari, *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords* (Berkeley 1979) 56-64.

[5] H. Chadwick, *op. cit.*, 109-112; R. Hanson, "A Note on Origen's Self-Mutilation," *Vigiliae Christianae* 20 (1966) 81-82; P. Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man* (Berkeley 1983) 88-90 and S. Elm, *"Virgins of God": The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 1994) 122-24.

[6] Chadwick, *op. cit.*, 111; cf. Baur, *op. cit.*, 241.

[7] *De virg.* 62 (797A): εἰς τὸ ἀναστεῖλαι πολλοὺς ἤδη τοιούτους ἐπιπολάσαντας τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ εὐνούχους.

[8] *Const. Apost.* 8,47,21-24; Nicaean Council can. 1 (produced below, n. 47).

[9] A. Vööbus, for example, while admitting in a footnote that Origen denies self-castration was a practice of Marcion's followers, asserts in his main text that Marcionites "did not hesitate to mutilate their bodies" (*History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient* 1 [CSCO 184; Louvain 1958] 51 and n. 94), extrapolating from Tertullian's somewhat vague remark (below, n. 35).

other influences (not necessarily by alliance to a heretical group), embraced radical corporeal asceticism as a fundamental part of Christian devotion. Moreover, the sources indicate that self-castration was sometimes adopted by male ascetics to allay suspicion which might otherwise arise from their living with female ascetics. Its prohibition was concomitant not only with a growing concern to determine acceptable ascetic practice, but acceptable social practices between ascetics as well: how avowed male and female virgins ought to associate with each other, and what outward signs should manifest their virginal status. In conclusion I will suggest that one reason for its condemnation was that castration proved an ambiguous signifier, since the continence (ἐγκράτεια) and self-control (σωφροσύνη) of the castrated Christian were not in fact made clear or guaranteed by this seemingly unambiguous form of bodily inscription.

2. *Christian Eunuchs and Orthodox Praxis*

Eunuchs were no new breed to the Roman empire of the Christian era. Castration had long been the physical mark of slavery (of slaves brought in from outside the empire)[10] and of religious devotion in the so-called oriental cults.[11] Although Domitian and Nerva had banned castration within the borders of the empire and Hadrian had made it a capital offense for both castrator and castrated,[12] the laws evidently did not apply to those who had castrated themselves,[13] and the practice continued, as it had for hundreds of years, among the "Galli" priests and devotees of Cybele (Magna Mater), Atargatis and the Scythian goddess. Ancient references to eunuchs express a general belief that eunuchs constituted a bizarre race of

---

[10] K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Sociological Studies in Roman History 1; Cambridge 1978), 172 n. 4 and p. 192; P. Guyot, *Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Stuttgarter Beiträge zur Geschichte und Politik 14: Stuttgart, 1980).

[11] A.D. Nock, "Eunuchs in Ancient Religion," in Z. Stewart, ed., *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* 1 (Cambridge, MA 1972) 6-15.

[12] Cass. Dio 67,2,3; 68,2,4; Suet. *Domit.* 7,1; *Digest* 48,8,4,2. Roman jurisprudence conceived castration as tantamount to murder and assimilated it to circumcision: see *Digest* 48,8,11,1. Their legal relationship is discussed by E. Smallwood, "The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision," *Latomus* 18 (1959) 334-47 and 20 (1961) 93-96.

[13] A. Rousselle, in *Porneia: On Desire and the Body in Antiquity*, trans. F. Pheasant (Cambridge, MA 1988) 126, observes that Roman law says nothing about anyone who *se abscidit, se eviravit*, and there is no testimony for its application to the Galli.

indeterminate gender.[14] Most fundamentally, castration conferred a distinct mark of alterity upon the castrated.[15] This milieu and perception of eunuchs must be taken into an account of the Christian practice of castration, in so far as it would not have been a wholly unthinkable (albeit radical) option for a man in the empire to choose as a means of setting himself apart from others, either religiously or socially, while at the same time following what he perceived to be the demands of his religion.[16] We do not possess sources which reveal the significance of eunuchism in non-Christian devotion.[17] The Christian sources, however, indicate that the figure of the eunuch provided early Christians with an emblem of extreme chastity, highlighting a sharp contrast in sexual conduct between Christians and pagans.

The apologists Justin and Athenagoras seized upon this figure and invested it with the virtue of sexual continence. This was not a virtue outsiders commonly associated with Christianity in the late second century. As a pagan critic remarks in Minucius Felix's *Octavius* (ca. 170-75),

> They introduce everywhere a kind of religious lust, a promiscuous "brotherhood" and "sisterhood" by which ordinary fornication, under the cover of a hallowed name, is converted to incest.[18]

---

[14] E.g., *tertium . . . semiviri genus habent* (Pliny, *H.N.* 11, 49 [110], ed. C. Mayhoff [Leipzig 1909] 369); εὐνούχων γένος . . . ἄθηλυ, ἄνανδρον (Basil. Caes., *Ep.* 115, ed. R. Deferrari [Loeb; Cambridge, MA 1987] 230); *ab utroque sexu aut naturae origo aut clades corporis separavit* (Claud. Mamert., *Gratiarum Act.* 19,4, ed. G. Barabino [Genova 1965] 98). See M. Gleason, *Making Men* (Princeton 1995) 133-34 and 161.

[15] P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York 1988) 169; Nock, *op. cit.*, 14.

[16] While references to self-made Christian eunuchs are found in western (e.g., below, n. 68) as well as eastern texts, the evidence comes mostly from the east, especially the region of Phrygia (e.g. below, n. 31) where the rites of the Galli originated. This regional concentration suggests the non-Christian practice of self-castration was germane to the Christian, but only Basil of Ancyra specifically draws this link (below, n. 32).

[17] Nock (among others) believes pagans castrated themselves to ensure their ritual purity; against this view cf. Rousselle, *op. cit.*, 125-127. Seneca observes that Romans commonly attributed divinity to those who mutilate their bodies: *cum aliquis secandi lacertos suos artifex brachia atque umeros suspensa manu cruentat . . . divinum esse eum . . . affirmatis* (*De vita beata*, 26,8, ed. L. Renolds [Oxford 1977] 196), and Tertullian remarks that among pagans *alia vis* [i.e., a divine influence] *pronuntietur in eo qui genitalia vel lacertos . . . prosecat* (*Apol.* 23,3; ed. H. Hoppe [CSEL 69; Wein 1939] 64).

[18] *Oct.* 9,2, ed. J. Beaujeu (Paris 1964) 12: *se promisce appellant fratres et sorores, ut etiam non insolens stuprum intercessione sacri nominis fiat incestum.* For similar charges see, e.g., Justin *Apol.* 26,7; *Dial.* 10; Tatian, 25; Tertullian, *Apol.* 4,11; Origen, *C.Cel.* 6,40.

Of course, charges of sexual impropriety were regularly laid against fringe religious groups in Rome. Nonetheless by the late-second century Christian groups enjoying a revolutionary sense of social liberation by virtue of their baptism had sprung up there and elsewhere.[19] From the group celibacy of the Encratites to the sexual libertinism reportedly espoused by such Egyptian groups as the Barbeliotes and Carpocrations, the communal interaction these Christian groups enjoyed challenged propriety by mingling male and female in close, if not sexual, proximity.[20]

It was perhaps in response to suspicions of such groups that Justin Martyr and the young Alexandrian of his *Apology* felt the need to prove (one rhetorically, the other physically) that continence was indeed a Christian virtue both in theory and practice. Self-castration for them offered the clearest proof. About twenty years later (ca. 177), Athenagoras addressed an apology to Marcus Aurelius that employed the figure of the eunuch again to illustrate the fusion of Christian regard for chastity with practice:

> You might find many among us, both men and women, growing old and unmarried in the hope of living more closely with God. But if remaining in virginity and the state of a eunuch draws one nearer to God, while the indulgence of carnal thoughts and desires leads one away, then all the more do we abstain from doing that which we avoid thinking about. For our interests lie not in the study of words, but in the display and teaching of deeds.[21]

In stark contrast to such Christian "eunuchs" Athenagoras inveighs against those pagans who

> have set up a market for fornication . . . outraging all the noblest and fairest bodies in all sorts of ways, dishonoring God's fair craftsmanship. . . . These adulterers and pederasts defame [our] eunuchs and once-married.[22]

In this early apology Athenagoras presents the figure of the eunuch in terms that were to become accepted in orthodox Christianity—not as a

---

[19] In the *didaskaleia* of such teachers as Marcion, Tatian and Valentinus: Brown, *op. cit.*, 86-91.

[20] See below, n. 53.

[21] *Leg. pro Christ.* 33,2-4, ed. B. Pouderon (SC 379; Paris 1992) 196-98: Εὕροις δ' ἂν πολλοὺς τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας καταγηράσκοντας ἀγάμους ἐλπίδι τοῦ μᾶλλον συνέσεσθαι τῷ θεῷ. Εἰ δὲ τὸ ἐν παρθενίᾳ καὶ ἐν εὐνουχίᾳ μεῖναι, μᾶλλον παρίστησι τῷ θεῷ, τὸ δὲ μέχρις ἐννοίας καὶ ἐπιθυμίας ἐλθεῖν ἀπάγει· ὧν τὰς ἐννοίας φεύγομεν, πολὺ πρότερον τὰ ἔργα παραιτούμεθα. Οὐ γάρ ⟨ἐν⟩ μελέτῃ λόγων ἀλλ' ἐπιδείξει καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ ἔργων τὰ ἡμέτερα.

[22] *Ibid.*, 34,2-3 (198-200): ἀτιμοῦντες καὶ τὸ ποιητὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καλόν . . . κακίζοντες οἱ μοιχοὶ καὶ παιδερασταὶ τοὺς εὐνούχους καὶ μονογάμους.

physical eunuch (the context does not support this interpretation) but rather a "spiritual" eunuch, simply the male equivalent of the untouched female virgin. He uses it to underscore how Christians "exercise the greatest care . . . on behalf of those to whom we apply the names of brothers and sisters . . . that their bodies remain undefiled and uncorrupted."[23] These apologists thus used the figure of the eunuch to project a very different image of Christian sexuality against the prevailing suspicions of their time.

But while apologists may have found this image rhetorically useful for depicting Christian moral integrity to outsiders, many Christians were dismayed to see it take physical form among themselves. The notoriety of Origen's alleged self-castration (ca. 209) is a case in point. When, despite his care to conceal the act, it became known to his Christian community, the bishop Demetrius responded with worried ambivalence: though admitting the "zeal and sincerity of faith" it exhibited, Demetrius "marveled at [Origen] exceedingly for his rashness."[24] According to Eusebius the bishop eventually found it a useful basis of slander against Origen, and later Origen himself advised young men not to go so far in their "fanciful fear of God and unmeasured desire for self-control."[25] Perhaps remembering the reception of his own self-castration, he warns that those who do so will only "subject themselves to reproach, perhaps also to ignominy, not only from those alien to the faith, but even from all those who usually forgive the deeds of men" (i.e., fellow Christians).[26]

Indeed, the tacit approval with which Justin regards his Alexandrian youth is exceptional in the extant Christian sources. The second/third century apocryphal *Acts of John* presents another young man who, upon converting

---

[23] *Ibid.*, 32,5 (196).

[24] Eusebius, *H.E.* 6,8,3, ed. G. Bardy (SC 41; Paris 1955) 96: Εὖ μάλα μὲν αὐτὸν ἀποθαυμάζει τοῦ τολμήματος, τὴν δέ γε προθυμίαν καὶ τὸ γνήσιον αὐτοῦ τῆς πίστεως ἀποδεξάμενος. Origen's concealment: 6,8,2.

[25] Origen, *Comment. in Matt. XV* 1, ed. E. Klostermann – E. Benz, in *Origenes Werke* 10 (GCS 40; Berlin 1935) 349: φαντασίᾳ φόβου Θεοῦ καὶ σωφροσύνης ἀμέτρῳ ἔρωτι.

[26] *Ibid.*: ἑαυτοὺς ὑποβεβλήκασιν ὀνειδισμῷ, τάχα δὲ καὶ αἰσχύνῃ . . . καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσι μᾶλλον τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις πράγμασι συγγινώσκουσιν. Later in the commentary he contrasts his former literal interpretation of Matt. 19:12 with his later spiritual interpretation: Ἡμεῖς δὲ Χριστὸν (τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ) "κατὰ σάρκα" καὶ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα ποτὲ νοήσαντες, "(ἀλλὰ) νῦν οὐκέτι" γινώσκοντες, οὐκ εὐδοκοῦμεν ὡς καλῶς ἐξειληφόσι τοῖς καὶ τὸν τρίτον εὐνουχισμόν [of Matt. 19:12] ἑαυτοῖς προφάσει τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐπάγουσι, *ibid.*, 3 (GCS 40, 354). I am therefore inclined to accept Origen's self-castration as historical fact, a νεανίευμα he later renounced. Eusebius clearly believed its historicity, but presents it as a conscientious attempt to avoid slander: below, n. 63.

to Christianity, "took the sickle and cut off his private parts." When he ran to John to show what he had done, the apostle displayed little charity toward the man's first act as a Christian: it was rather "the devices of Satan" that had made him "cut off [his] unruly members as if this were a virtuous act."[27] But despite John's assurance on this point, neophytes in the early Christian centuries may well have had trouble discerning which ascetic acts had the approval of God and which were the "devices of Satan," or exactly what limits should be placed upon their zeal for ἐγκράτεια. Until the limits of "orthodox" theory and practice had become established, widely disseminated and enforced, such zealots received very different signals as to what they should do with this particularly problematic area of the body. The anti-heretical works of Irenaeus, Clement and Epiphanius amply exhibit the sheer variety of Christian speculation on, and experimentation with, their corporeal status between the second and fourth centuries. Different groups sanctioned different acts. However, although acts of self-mortification became mostly associated with unorthodox Christian teachers, it is important for our understanding of the phenomenon of self-castration to see that these were not its only recognized proponents. In response to men who had "dared to castrate" themselves, Origin makes a studied appeal in his *Commentary on Matthew* against the influence of non-Christian texts which are able to incite a "more fervent soul" towards "this sort of rashness."[28] He cites a passage from the *Maxims* of Sextus, "a book borne in esteem by many," urging its reader to "cast away every part of the body that misleads you to a lack of self-control, since it is better for you to live without the part in self-control than to live with it to your peril." Origen states that Sextus has "provided an inducement" for self-castration by writing, with apparent allusion to medical amputation, that

> You may see men cutting off and casting away parts of their body in order that the rest may be strong: how much better to do this for the sake of self-control?

Origen also cites Philo's treatise *The Worse is Accustomed to Attack the Better* as a provocation towards the act, since Philo there asserts "it is better to make oneself a eunuch than to rage madly for unlawful sexual intercourse."[29]

---

[27] *Act. Johannis* 53-54, trans. G. Stead in E. Hennecke, W. Schneemelcher and R.McL. Wilson, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha* 2 (Philadelphia 1965) 241.

[28] *Comment. in Matt. XV* 3 (GCS 40, 354): ἐωράκειμεν τοὺς τολμήσαντας καὶ ἐντετεύχειμεν τοῖς δυναμένοις θερμοτέραν κινῆσαι ψυχὴν (καὶ πιστὴν μέν, οὐ λογικὴν δὲ) πρὸς τὸ τοιοῦτον τόλμημα.

[29] *Ibid.*, (354-55): Φησὶ δὴ Σέξτος ἐν ταῖς Γνώμαις, βιβλίῳ φερομένῳ παρὰ πολλοῖς ὡς

The influence of precepts such as these would have been reinforced by the association of eunuchism, literal or figurative, with outstanding members of the Christian community. After all, if a teacher as revered as Origen was believed to have castrated himself, or a figure as revered as Melito, Bishop of Sardis, was referred to as "the eunuch, living wholly in the Holy Spirit,"[30] or if such an epithet could appear on a Christian gravestone,[31] and self-castration had already been a technique of long-standing in non-Christian devotional circles,[32] it is not so surprising that many young Christians, "young men hot with the faith" who "possess a passion for self-control, though not according to knowledge,"[33] thought it admirable to use a knife or sickle in the service of their zeal.

In Origen's view, such youths simply acted out of a combined "fear toward God" and naiveté with respect to the true meaning of the scriptures.[34] For Tertullian and the author of the *Acts of John*, however, self-made eunuchs represented something more sinister. As Tertullian's association of eunuchs with a Marcionite conception of God makes clear,[35] by the third century

---

δοκίμῳ· "πᾶν μέρος τοῦ σώματος τὸ ἀναπεῖθόν σε μὴ σωφρονεῖν, ῥῖψον· ἄμεινον γὰρ χωρὶς τοῦ μέρους ζῆν σωφρόνως ἢ μετὰ τοῦ μέρους ὀλεθρίως". καὶ πάλιν . . . ἀφορμὴν διδοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ παραπλήσιον λέγει· "ἀνθρώπους ἴδοις ἂν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ σώματος ἔχειν ἐρρωμένον ἀποκόπτοντας αὐτῶν καὶ ῥίπτοντας μέρη· πόσῳ βέλτιον ὑπὲρ τοῦ σωφρονεῖν;" καὶ Φίλων . . . φησὶν . . . ὅτι "ἐξευνουχισθῆναι μὲν ἄμεινον ἢ πρὸς συνουσίας ἐκνόμους λυττᾶν". Origin quotes precepts 13 and 273 of Sextus' *Maxims*; Chadwick believes Sextus himself was refering to physical castration (*op. cit.*, 99-100).

[30] Eusebius, *H.E.* 5,24,5 (SC 41, 68): τὸν εὐνοῦχον, τὸν ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πάντα πολιτευσάμενον.

[31] As in inscription #11 (from Laodicea Combusta) dated between 323 and 350 by W. Calder, "The Epigraphy of the Anatolian Heresies," in W. Buckler – W. Calder, eds., *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* (Manchester 1923) 90-91: [ὁ δεῖνα υἱῷ] Αὐρ. Ἀππᾷ πρεσβ[υτέρ] (1) ᾧ εὐνούκῳ . . . μνήμης χάρι[ν]. Calder's assertion that εὐνούκῳ should be interpreted literally may be questioned, since it may have been used here to describe Appas' celibacy (or spirituality: he was married) as it apparently was used to describe Melito's.

[32] Basil, writing near Phrygia, suggests the affinity of Christians who castrate themselves with the "Greeks in the past," i.e., the Galli of the region: Φανερὸν γάρ, ὅτι δαίμονος μεθοδεία τὸ ἔργον· διότι ὁ μὲν πάλιν βίος παρ' Ἕλλησι τούτους, νυνὶ δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀτόπως ὑπέδειξε, *De virg.* 62 (797A).

[33] Origen, *Comment. in Matt. XV* 3 (GCS 40, 355): θερμῶν μὲν τῇ ⟨δὲ⟩ πίστει νεωτέρων, οἷς ὁμολογεῖν χρὴ ὅτι ἔρωτα σωφροσύνης ἔχουσιν "ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν."

[34] *Ibid.*, 1 (349): ἀπὸ φόβου μὲν τοῦ πρὸς Θεὸν, ἀνεπιστημόνως δέ. Also see below, n. 43.

[35] *Ad. Marc.* 4,11, ed. A. Kroymann (CSEL 47; Wein 1906) 451: Marcion's God *conjunctas non admittit, neminem tinguit nisi caelibem aut spadonem. Spadonem* however may not mean here a man who has castrated himself. Tertullian himself distinguishes the celibate

critics perceived the act as emblematic of a specific theological orientation and attitude towards material creation which not only effected the way a person viewed marriage, but also how he perceived his corporeal status. In other words, self-castration became associated with the "dualist" doctrines espoused by Marcion, Tatian *et al.*, which tended to denigrate the body as the nagging link between the human soul and the evils they believed inherent in the material world. Unfortunately their teachings allegedly conducive towards self-castration can only be read in the fringes of the discourse of more "orthodox" writers, especially in their discussions of Matthew 19:12. There Jesus himself presents the figure of the eunuch as a religious ideal for his disciples:

> There are eunuchs, that were so born from their mothers' womb; and there are eunuchs, that were made so by men; and there are eunuchs that have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven.[36]

Whatever Jesus had intended by this utterance, its radical suggestion begged either literal practice or hermeneutic revision among subsequent Christian thinkers and practitioners. It is in fact one of the few gospel passages that may be read as an exhortation to asceticism or a basis for a hierarchy of Christian practitioners: "Not all men can receive this saying, but they to whom it is given . . . he that is able to receive it, let him receive it." Certainly Origen's characterization of the soul of the self-castrator as πιστὴν μὲν, οὐ λογικὴν δὲ suggests that the gut reaction of certain Christians to this passage was to "make themselves a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven." However, none of the exegeses that have come down to us advocate a literal interpretation of the passage.[37] On the contrary: the more "orthodox" writers used exegesis either to moderate corporeal asceticism or check it completely.

Clement of Alexandria, whose early third-century *Miscellanies* preserves the earliest known attempt to interpret Mt. 19:12, exemplifies this. According to Clement, the followers of the second-century Christian teacher Basilides believed the passage signified three types of celibates: those "by nature," i.e. by an innate revulsion toward women; those "by necessity," certain

---

spadones voluntarii in his own church from those who *"officia membrorum ludibrose . . . oblatrant": De carn. res.* 61, ed. A. Kroymann (CSEL 47; Wein 1906) 122-23.

[36] Matt. 19:11-12: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσιν τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ἀλλ' οἷς δέδοται, εἰσὶν γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτως, καὶ εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω.

[37] Baur, *op. cit.*, provides a general discussion of early references to Matt. 19:12.

θεατρικοὶ ἀσκηταί who "control themselves because of their passion for fame" as well as those physically castrated by some misfortune; and those "by reasoned principle," who opt for celibacy "because of the distractions involved in marriage."[38] Though Clement criticizes other attitudes the Basilidians supposedly held about marriage, he does not specifically criticize their interpretation of Matthew; indeed their equation of the third type of eunuch with celibacy by "reasoned principle" seems to accord with his own view that "one man may make himself a eunuch [i.e., remain celibate], another join in marriage to have children; both ought to have the aim of remaining firmly opposed to any lower standard."[39] Nevertheless in other instances Clement deradicalizes the third type of eunuch even further, in order to affirm the Christians' right to marry against the objections of certain "high strung" Christian teachers who found in the scriptural eunuchs (including, besides Mt. 19:12, those of Isaiah 56:3: "Let not the eunuch say, 'Behold, I am a dry tree.' For thus says Jehovah of eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and hold fast my covenants: . . . I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off") their justification for promoting total sexual abstinence. Clement says that such teachers (particularly a certain Julius Cassius, who had written a work entitled *On Continence* or *On Eunuchism*) "through continence, euphemistically blaspheme against creation and the holy creator."[40] Rather than interpreting scriptural eunuchs as symbols of sexual continence, Clement argues instead that "a eunuch [as in Is. 56:3] does not mean a man who has been castrated, or even an unmarried man, but a man who is unproductive of truth," who nevertheless observes God's precepts and so attains "higher esteem than those educated in word alone without right conduct." While Clement affirms that "those who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven" are "blessed," he glosses Mt. 19:12 to mean those who are "free from all sin by their abstinence from the world."[41] Thus

---

[38] *Strom.* 3,1,1,2-4, ed. O. Stählin – L. Früchtel in *Clemens Alexandrinus* 2 (GCS 52 [15]; Berlin 1960) 195: "οἱ δὲ ἕνεκα τῆς αἰωνίου βασιλείας εὐνουχίσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ γαμοῦ," φασὶ, "συμβαίνοντα, τὸν ἐπιλογισμὸν τοῦτον λαμβάνουσι, τὴν περὶ τὸν πορισμὸν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἀσχολίαν δεδιότες."

[39] *Ibid.*, 3,12,79,3 (231): Ἡ πρόθεσίς τε ἑκάστου, τοῦ τε ἑαυτὸν εὐνουχίσαντος τοῦ τε αὖ γάμῳ διὰ παιδοποιίαν συζεύξαντος, ἀνένδοτος πρὸς τὸ ἧττον διαμένειν ὀφείλει.

[40] *Ibid.*, 3,5,40,2 (214): τὸ ὑπέρτονον ἄγουσαι, ἐγκάτειαν διὰ δυσσεβείας . . . καταγγέλλουσι . . .; 3,6,45,1 (216): Τοῖς δὲ εὐφήμως δι' ἐγκρατείας ἀσεβοῦσιν εἴς τε τὴν κτίσιν καὶ τὸν ἅγιον δημιουργόν. On Julius Cassianus and his work, see 3,13,91-92.

[41] *Ibid.*, 3,15,99,1 (241), refuting Cassianus' use of Is. 56:3 with Mt. 19:12 (see 3,13,91,2)

through allegorical exegesis Clement divests the eunuchs of Is. 56:3 and Mt. 19:12 of any sexual significance: rather than legitimizing an "impious" stress on sexual abstinence, for him they simply represent abstinence from the immoral trappings of "the world" in general.

With this shift Clement represents a distinct break from previous writers, who all had referred to the eunuch specifically as a symbol of sexual continence. His effort to free the figure of all physical implications was perhaps calculated to appeal to the clergy of his era, recruited from married Alexandrian householders.[42] Such a social concern may have also accompanied the theological objections towards self-castration voiced by Church authorities of the fourth century, by which time an ascetic movement that included not merely renunciation of marriage but also extreme forms of self-mortification had become influencial and widespread in Christian communities. To judge from the sources, the numbers of Christians who had castrated themselves had by that time become rather conspicuous. In addition to the testimony of Basil who, as quoted above, was alarmed by the spread of "many such men" in the Church, Epiphanius of Salamis observed by 377 that "not a few" monks in Egypt had "dared to make themselves eunuchs."[43] He describes one Transjordanian sect, the Valesians, who

> are all castrated except for a few . . . when they take someone as a disciple, as long as he has not yet been castrated he does not partake of animal flesh. But once they have persuaded or forced him to be castrated, then he partakes of anything whatsoever. . . . They not merely discipline their own this way, but often impose the same on strangers passing through, entertained by them as guests.

---

to advocate complete sexual abstinence: εὐνοῦχος τοίνυν οὐχ ὁ κατηναγκασμένος τὰ μόρια οὐδὲ μὴν ὁ ἄγαμος εἴρηται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἄγονος ἀληθείας. "ξύλον" οὗτος "ξηρὸν" ἦν πρότερον, ὑπακούσας δὲ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ "φυλάξας τὰ σάββατα" κατὰ ἀποχὴν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ ποιήσας τὰς ἐντολὰς ἐντιμότερος ἔσται τῶν ἄνευ πολιτείας ὀρθῆς λόγῳ μόνῳ παιδευομένων; 3,15,99,4 (241-42, glossing Mt. 19-12): ἀλλ' "οἱ μὲν εὐνουχίσαντες ἑαυτοὺς" ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας "διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν" μακάριοι οὗτοί εἰσιν, οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες. For Clement, continence is an internal virtue of the soul, not to be displayed outwardly; cf. 3,6,48,3 (218): ἡ ἐγκράτεια ψυχῆς ἀρετή, ἡ οὐκ ἐν φανερῷ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ.

[42] Brown, *op. cit.*, 58.

[43] *De fide* 13,5, ed. K. Holl – J. Dummer in *Epiphanius* 3 (GCS; Berlin 1985) 513: ἕτεροι δὲ καὶ οὐκ ὀλίγοι εὐνουχίζειν ἑαυτοὺς . . . δῆθεν νεανιεύματος χάριν ἐτόλμησαν. An early Latin apophthegm ("PJ" 15.88; PL 73.968-969) tells how Epiphanius confronted two monks who *aemulationem autem habentes vocis evangelicae, sed non secundum scientiam, castraverunt se quasi propter regna coelorum.*

Epiphanius adds that "most of these Valesians had been in the Church up to a certain time, until their madness spread, and they were expelled."[44] Thirteen years later John Chrysostom inveighed against those who had mutilated themselves around Antioch.[45]

The practice of self-castration thus persisted despite its condemnation in early Church regulations. Both the Council of Nicaea (canon 1, 325) and the authors of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (canons 22-24, drawn up perhaps at Antioch, ca. 380)[46] banned such men from entering the clergy; the latter also punished the laity who castrated themselves with three years' excommunication. The *Apostolic Constitutions* clearly articulate the belief that self-castration stemmed from a view of the material world deemed heretical: "Let not one who has mutilated himself become a cleric: for he is . . . an enemy of God's creation."[47] Thus the Church came to turn against Christian eunuchs the charge Athenagoras had made against pagans for "dishonoring God's fair craftsmanship." Self-castration, always a mark of alterity, had become an indication of heretical sympathies within the Church. John Chrysostom calls such eunuchs "men who scorn God's creation," and assimilates them to Manichaeans, whom he accuses of self-castration as well.[48]

---

[44] *Pan.* 58,1,4-7, ed. K. Holl – J. Dummer in *Epiphanius* 2 (GCS; Berlin 1980) 358: εἰσὶ δὲ πάντες ἀπόκοποι πλὴν ὀλίγων . . . καὶ ὅταν λάβωσιν ἄνθρωπον εἰς μαθητείαν, καθ' ὅσον μὲν χρόνον οὔπω τῶν μορίων ἀπετμήθη, ἐμψύχων οὐ μεταλαμβάνει· ὅταν δὲ πείσωσι τὸν τοιοῦτον ἢ μετὰ ἀνάγκης αὐτὸν ἀποτέμωσι, τότε πᾶν ὁτιοῦν μεταλαμβάνει ὡς ἤδη πεπαυμένος ἀγῶνος καὶ μηκέτι ἐπικίνδυνος ὢν εἰς τὸ ἐποτρύνεσθαι διὰ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων εἰς ἡδονὴν ἥκειν ἐπιθυμίας. οὐ μόνον δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους τοῦτον ἀπαρτίζουσι τὸν τρόπον, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις καὶ ξένους παρερχομένους καὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιξενωθέντας ταύτῃ διέθεντο τῇ ἀγωγῇ. Trans. F. Williams, *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius of Salamis II and III* (Leiden 1987) 99, who notes that Epiphanius' sources are oral (98 n. 1).

[45] *In cap. V. Ep. ad Gal. comm.* 3,717 (PG 61, 668).

[46] M. Metzger, "Origine et date de *CA*," in *Les Constitutions Apostoliques* 1 (SC 329; Paris 1985) 54-62.

[47] *Const. Apost.* 8,47,22, ed. M. Metzger in *Les Constitutions Apostoliques* 3 (SC 336; Paris 1987) 280: Ὁ ἀκρωτηριάσας ἑαυτὸν μὴ γινέσθω κληρικός· αὐτοφονευτὴς γάρ ἐστιν καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δημιουργίας ἐχθρός; 23: Εἴ τις κληρικὸς ὢν ἑαυτὸν ἀκρωτηριάσῃ, καθαιρείσθαι· φονεὺς γάρ ἐστιν ἑαυτοῦ. 24: Λαικὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀκρωτηριάσας ἀφοριζέσθαι ἔτη τρία· ἐπίβουλος γάρ ἐστιν ἑαυτοῦ. (Canon 21 permits eunuchs castrated by others to become bishops.) Council of Nicaea, canon 1, ed. J. Hefele – H. Leclerq in *Histoire des conciles* 1,1 (Hildescheim 1973) 528-29: εἰ δέ τις ὑγιαίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐξέτεμε, τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ἐξεταζόμενον πεπαῦσθαι προσήκει, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ δεῦρο μηδένα τῶν τοιούτων χρῆναι προάγεσθαι . . . εἴ τινες ὑπὸ βαρβάρων ἢ δεσποτῶν εὐνουχίσθησαν, εὑρίσκοιντο δὲ ἄλλως ἄξιοι, τοὺς τοιούτους εἰς κλῆρον προσίεται ὁ κανών.

[48] *In cap. V. Ep. ad Galat. comm.* 3,717 (PG 61, 668): τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δημιουργίαν δια-

Matthew 19:12 presented early Christian apologists and teachers with a vivid image that might designate a Christian elite, singled out as "those to whom it is given." Since Jesus did not clarify what characteristics—physical, moral or intellectual—the figure of the eunuch signified, it posed a challenge for exegetes to determine these themselves. For the more "orthodox" authorities, self-made Christian eunuchs represented the most dire consequence of literal-minded, "heretical" hermenuetics, especially those which legitimized a harshly corporeal mode of asceticism. Indeed it seems appropriate that John Chrysostom addressed this practice in his *Commentary to Galatians*. In Galatians Paul tells how he debated whether circumcision should be required as a mark of Christian faith. Paul argued that, by virtue of their baptism in Christ, Christians no longer had to apply the commandments of the Torah to themselves literally, and therefore did not have to undergo physical circumcision. The relevance of Paul's hermenuetic position to the later issue of self-castration is made explicit by Origen in his *Commentary on Matthew*. Citing II Corinthians 3:6, Origen states that Paul's dictum that "The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life" must certainly be applied in an interpretation of Mt. 19:12.[49] Not to do so, Origen asserts, is to adhere to the teaching of Marcion, who claimed that scriptures ought not to be interpreted allegorically.[50] Two hundred years after Paul the areas of the body had slightly changed, but the issue was still the same; and instead of Jewish Christians representing the other side of the debate, that position had become identified with heretical Christians.[51]

βάλλοντες, καὶ τοῖς Μανιχαίοις συμπράττοντες ... οὗτοι δὲ διὰ τῶν ἔργων τοῖς χαλεποῖς δόγμασι τούτους διδόασιν ἀφορμήν· ὡς γὰρ ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐπίβουλον ἀποκόπτουσι τὸ μέλος.

[49] *Comment. in Matt. XV* 1 (GCS 40, 351): Τὸ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποεῖ, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν προκείμενον τρόπον ὁμολογητέον.

[50] *Ibid.*, 3 (356): εἴπερ τι ἀκόλουθον ἑαυτῷ ὁ Μαρκίων πεποίηκε φάσκων μὴ δεῖν ἀλληγορεῖν τὴν γραφήν.

[51] The problem of self-castration did not end in the fourth century: cf. Rule #55 of the fifth-century monastic rules attributed to Rabbula: "No one of the sons of the church, those upon whom the name of the Messiah has been called, shall dare to castrate himself" (trans. A. Vööbus, *Syriac and Arabic Documents regarding Legislation Relative to Syrian Asceticism* [Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile 11; Stockholm 1960] 49). See also *idem, History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient* 2 (CSCO 197; Louvain 1960) 257-58; Nilus of Ancyra, *Ep.* 1,323 (PG 79, 200A); Cyril of Scythopolis, *V. Sabae* 41.

3. *Self-Castration and Social Relations of Male and Female Ascetics*

Basil's treatise on virginity, however, attests that self-castration involved other issues besides theology. His discussion of eunuchs is mainly concerned with the practical matter of the danger they posed to virgins.[52] He thus places the phenomenon of self-castration in a social context similar to that which raised suspicions among pagans: namely, close relations between male and female virgins. This issue received considerable attention from Church fathers, and suggests other motives behind the practice and prohibition of self-castration.

In Galatians 3:28 Paul presents his audience with the potentially revolutionary notion that Christianity had obliterated traditional social boundaries: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, slave or free man, male or female; for you are all one in Jesus Christ." By the mid-second century communal travel and cohabitation between the sexes had become a feature of certain early Christian communities, premised by a mutual commitment to chastity.[53] But like their pagan critics, few Christian writers appear to have believed men and women could share such companionship without succumbing to sexual temptations.[54] A late second/early third-century treatise addressed to male and female virgins reflects such doubts. Its author cites

> evil rumors and reports concerning shameless men who, under the pretext of a fear of God, have their dwellings with maidens . . . and walk with them along the road and in solitary places alone, a course which is full of dangers, stumbling blocks and pit-falls, nor in any respect right for Christians and those who fear God to conduct themselves.[55]

---

[52] *De virg.* 64 (800B): Διὸ εἴπερ σκοπός ἐστι τῇ παρθένῳ ἄφθορον ἑαυτῆς τὴν ἔνδον παρθενίαν φυλάξαι, ἀκριβούτω καὶ τὰς πρὸς τούτους [i.e., men who have castrated themselves] ἀεὶ ὁμιλίας. For general discussion of Basil's treatise, its audience and social context, see Elm, *op. cit.*, 113-24.

[53] Brown, *op. cit.*, 92-102; Elm, *op. cit.*, 47-59, 184-223.

[54] E.g., Epiphanius, whose allegations against the "Encratites" are similar to those lodged against Christians in the *Octavius: Pan.* 47,3,1 (GCS [1980] 218). Clement's account of the apostles' missionary conduct (*Strom.* 3,6,53,3; GCS 52, 220) illustrates an orthodox ideal for male-female ascetic relations. He imagines these couples traveled together, but were married; were married, but lived as brothers and sisters; instructed men and women, but males instructed males while females instructed females δι' ὧν καὶ εἰς τὴν γυναικωνῖτιν ἀδιαβλήτως παρεισεδύετο ἡ τοῦ κυρίου διδασκαλία.

[55] Ps.-Clement, *Ep. I ad virg.* 10 This section of the treatise (originally written in Greek) survives in a Syriac text ed. T. Beelen, PG 1, 402A, whose Latin trans. (superior to that in PG) appears in F.X. Funk, ed., *Patres Apostolici* 2.2 (Tübingen 1913) 8:

The third and fourth-century phenomenon of the *virgines subintroductae*, the spiritual female friends and students of certain male ascetics and clerics, seems to have been a survival from such communities of travelers (and *didaskaleia*) of an earlier period. Eusebius records a letter describing the actions of a council at Antioch (268) brought against Paul of Samosata who, besides teaching objectionable doctrine, was known to keep such women in his household; his presbyters and deacons allegedly kept such company as well.[56] Cyprian addressed a similar situation at Carthage, ca. 250. There women,

> despite the fact that they once made the firm resolve to preserve their chaste status, have subsequently shared the same bed with men . . . while insisting on their virginity.[57]

Cyprian laments that "so many men" and "very many virgins" have been corrupted by "unlawful and perilous associations of this kind."[58] Other Christian authorities shared his distress. The councils of Elvira (canon 27, 306), Ancyra (canon 19, 314) and Nicaea (canon 3) reiterate the same position: "It cannot be permitted to either bishop, priest or any other cleric to have in his house a female companion, with the exception of his mother, sister, aunt of such persons who are free from all suspicion."[59] Repeated prohibitions against this arrangement demonstrate its continuing appeal at the time of Basil's treatise.

The situation prompting Basil's discussion of self-made eunuchs was that of Christians who had castrated themselves precisely "in order to obtain

---

loquimur de iis, quae loquimur, ob malos rumores de impudentibus quibusdam hominibus, qui sub pietatis praetextu cum virginibus habitant . . . aut soli cum illis deambulant per viam et solitudinem, viam periculis plenam et plenam offendiculis et laqueis et foveis, cuiusmodi agendi ratio Christianos et religiosos prorsus dedecet. English trans. B. Pratten, in A. Roberts – J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* 8 (Buffalo 1886) 58. A. von Harnack's "Die pseudoclementinischen Briefe De virginitate und die Entstehung des Mönchthums," *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 21 (1891) 361-85, remains the most thorough discussion of the treatise' author (anonymous, but identified by the fourth century with Clement of Rome), date and provenance (Syria, or perhaps Palestine). Coptic fragments indicate its author originally addressed male virgins as eunuchs: A. Guillaumont, *Annuaire du Collège de France 1981/82*, 433.

[56] *H.E.* 7,30,12.

[57] *Ep.* 4,1,1, ed, G. Diercks (CChr.SL 3B; Turnhout 1994) 17.

[58] *Ibid.*, 4,2,3.

[59] Nicaean Council, canon 3 (Hefele-Leclerq, 536-37). The Ancyran canon (*ibid.*, 321) prohibits virgins from living as "sisters" with anyone (not just clerics).

license for themselves" since "they want to live with women"[60] without danger or suspicion. Basil's testimony for such a motive is supported by isolated cases mentioned by Palladius, Eusebius and Socrates. Palladius records the vision of an Egyptian monk named Elias who, being especially φιλοπάρθενος, built a monastery on his property to care for wandering virgins. But tempted by desire, he withdrew to the desert and prayed either for death or the removal of his passion so he could care for the women κατὰ λόγον.[61] In response two sympathetic angels held down his arms and legs while a third castrated him: "thus . . . in his vision he was, one might say, thoroughly restored." Elias then safely lived another forty years ministering to female ascetics, "assuring the fathers that passion did not arise" in his thoughts thereafter.[62]

Although Elias' castration occurred only in a vision, the tale indicates how some men found in castration both a solution to the problem of prolonged exposure to the opposite sex and a means of explaining how they could live with women chastly. Eusebius presents Origen's self-castration as an attempt to avoid the slander of non-Christians which might have arisen "because, though young in age, he discoursed on things divine not only with men, but with women."[63] Socrates reports that Leontius, an Arian presbyter at Antioch in the early fourth century, was motivated to castrate himself "in order to remove all suspicion of illicit intercourse with a woman named Eustolium, with whom he spent a considerable amount of his time." After castrating himself, "he thenceforth lived more freely with her, since there was no longer any ground for slander against her."[64] Each describes different instances of castration, but they share the recognition that those castrated believed this act allayed any suspicion about sexual impropriety as they taught, cared for or lived with chaste women.

---

[60] *De virg.* 64 (800D): εἰρήκαμεν . . . περὶ τῶν ἵν' ἐξουσίαν ἑαυτοῖς πραγματεύσωνται, ὡς θέλουσιν ὁμιλεῖν γυναιξὶν, ἀποκοψαμένων ἀτόπως.

[61] *H.L.* 29, ed. C. Butler in *The Lausiac History of Palladius* (Text and Studies 6; Cambridge 1904) 84-85.

[62] *Ibid.*, (85): Ἔδοξεν οὖν ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, καὶ ἀποθεραπεύεσθαι. Afterwards Elias asserted τοῖς πατράσιν ὅτι εἰς τὴν διάνοιάν μου οὐκ ἀναβαίνει πάθος.

[63] *H.E.* 6,8,2 (SC 41, 95-96): διὰ τὸ νέον τὴν ἡλικίαν ὄντα μὴ ἀνδράσι μόνον, καὶ γυναιξὶ δὲ τὰ θεῖα προσομιλεῖν, ὡς ἂν πᾶσαν τὴν παρὰ τοῖς ἀπίστοις αἰσχρᾶς διαβολῆς ὑπόνοιαν.

[64] Socrates, *H.E.* 2,26 (PG 67, 269A): τὴν εἰς αὐτὴν αἰσχρὰν ὑπόνοιαν ἐπικρύψαι σπουδάσας, τῶν γεννητικῶν ἐξέτεμεν ἑαυτὸν, καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ παῤῥησιέστερον τῇ γυναικὶ συνδιῆγεν, ὡς μὴ ἔχων δι' ἃ εἰς αὐτὴν διεβάλλετο.

As Aline Rousselle observes, "In ancient times as in our day, there was a tendency to ignore or forget the fact that men who have no testicles still possess sexual powers."[65] Just as an Elias could be "persuaded" that he had been "relieved" of his "passion" by his vision of castration,[66] so was popular belief apparently persuaded that a man who had been castrated could be a safe companion for virgins. Because of the prevalence of this belief Cyril of Alexandria, in an early fifth-century homily *Against Eunuchs*, sternly warned wealthy members of his congregation that the eunuchs whom they trusted "to sleep with their women as guardians" really offered only "semblences" of self-control.[67] This trust extended all the more to Christians who had expressly become eunuchs "for the kingdom of heaven."[68] Basil's discussion is designed to dispel such naiveté. Such men, he writes,

> being unable to control themselves, and fearing they might be caught in the act, wholly liberate themselves for sexual intercourse by cutting off the evidence of this activity, that they might act on their desire as they wish. . . .[69]

Drawing on a background in medicine, Basil differs from all other writers on this subject in that he supports his case with medical theory, describing in detail how pent-in sperm boils up in the eunuch and torments him until he finds relief. By cleverly using his apparent impotence as "bait" to deceive a woman, he can gain easy access to her chamber and have sex with her without restraint. As proof Basil relates two cases known to him where eunuchs had seduced women, including a "virgin of the Church," in this manner.[70]

---

[65] Rousselle, *op. cit.*, 123 n. 65.

[66] *H.L.* 29 (Butler, 85) πέπεισμαι ἀπηλλάχθαι τοῦ πάθους.

[67] Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom.* 19, ed. C. de Boor in *Georgii Monachi Chronicon* 2 (Leipzig 1904) 652: μετὰ γυναικῶν δὲ ὡς φύλακες ἅμα καὶ σωφροσύνης δῆθεν ἰνδάλματα καθεύδοντες . . . τούτους γὰρ ἄνθρωποι καὶ μάλιστα προύχοντες, ὡς σώφρονας παραδεχόμενοι, πιστεύουσι καὶ εἰσοικίζουσιν. See also 654.

[68] As attested by the third-century *De singularitate clericorum* 33 (ed. G. Hartel [CSEL 3,3; Wein 1871] 208-09) which denounces self-made eunuchs as heretics, but not as unchaste; they at least exhibit superior chastity than clerics who, living with virgins, claim to be spiritual eunuchs—*in confusionem spadonum non dubito meliores adserere, qui nec sibi quidem parcunt.*

[69] *De virg.* 61 (793B): Οὐ δυνάμενοι γὰρ κρατεῖν ἑαυτῶν, εἶτα φοβούμενοι φωραθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ἔργῳ, ἵνα ἐξῇ αὐτοῖς ὡς βούλονται τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ κεχρῆσθαι . . . ἀποκόψαντες τὸν ἔλεγξον τῆς ἐνεργείας, ἐλευθεριάζουσιν ἀκρατῶς πρὸς τὰς μίξεις.

[70] Medical explication: 61, 796AB; "bait": *ibid.*: δέλεαρ δὲ τῶν διδύμων εὐνουχίαν τῇ γυναικὶ εἰς ἀπάτην δεινῶς ποιησάμενος, ἀκολαστότερον μίγνυται (see also 796D); case studies: 796B, D.

Basil's main point is that self-castration, though it might appear to signify self-control, is in reality a deception (in Cyril's phrase, a σωφροσύνης δῆθεν ἐνδάλμα). Such men are all the more insidious and dangerous because they appear to be emasculated. Basil counters that, as a bull is still a bull whether it has horns or not, so a man "who has cut off all his genitalia, does not become a woman by the loss of these; he is still by nature a man."[71] The success of this deception upon both men and women in Christian communities called for exposé. Yet Basil and Cyril were not the first to warn against equating castration with chastity. Already in the second and early third century the non-Christian writers Artemidorus and Philostratus associated false chastity and untrustworthiness with the ambiguity of eunuchs' sex. Thus Artemidorus considered the Galli, eunuchs and impotent men the kinds of people (along with actors, sophists and poor men) one ought not trust: "even if they do not say anything, they indicate false expectations, since by nature they cannot be numbered among men or women."[72] Philostratus' digression on eunuchs in his *Life of Apollonius* bears remarkable similarity to Basil's. While Apollonius' companion Damis naively assumes ("it is obvious to any child") eunuchs to be sufficiently chaste to enter women's apartments "since the operation of castration has deprived them of having sexual intercourse," Apollonius contends that "even eunuchs feel desire" and cannot be said to possess σωφροσύνη merely by virtue of castration, since this "consists not in one's not giving in to sexual intercourse when aroused with desire, but in abstinence and appearing superior to this madness."[73] These authors, by calling the eunuch's physical condition to be a deceptive signifier, broke the conventional wisdom of their day; their point had to be reiterated all the more in a Christian milieu whose tradition had long associated eunuchs with chastity and was still developing its monastic institutions.

About twenty years after the Council of Nicaea banned men who had castrated themselves from the clergy, another council met at Gangara in

---

[71] *Ibid.*, 63 (797CD): ἀλλ' ἔτι ἄρσην ἐστὶ τὴν φύσιν, κἂν μὴ ἔχῃ τὰ μόρια.

[72] *Onirocrit.* 2,69, ed. R. Pack (Leipzig 1963) 196: οὗτοι γὰρ καὶ μὴ λέγοντές τι ψευδεῖς τὰς ἐλπίδας εἶναι μηνύουσι διὰ τὸ φύσει μήτε ἐν ἀνδράσι μήτε ἐν γυναιξὶν ἀριθμεῖσθαι.

[73] *V. Apollonii* 1,33, ed. V. Mumprecht (Munich 1983) 100-102: Damis: τοῦτο . . . καὶ παιδὶ δῆλον· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ τομὴ τὸ ἀφροδισιάζειν ἀφαιρεῖται σφᾶς. Apollonius: καὶ εὐνοῦχοι ἐρῶσι καὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, ὅπερ ἐσάγονται διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, οὐκ ἀπομαραίνεται σφῶν . . . οὐκ ἄν μοι δοκῶ τοὺς εὐνούχους ποτὲ ἐς τὰ τῶν σωφρονούντων ἤθη προσγράψαι . . . σωφροσύνη γὰρ τὸ ὀρεγόμενον τε καὶ ὁρμῶντα μὴ ἡττᾶσθαι ἀφροδισίων, ἀλλ' ἀπέχεσθαι . . . τῆς λύττης ταύτης.

central Asia Minor to judge what they considered ascetic improprieties espoused by Eustathius of Sebaste. Among the practices the council condemned were those physically altering the appearance of female ascetics "under the pretense of asceticism": "Women now assume men's clothes," the council charged, "and think themselves justified thereby; nay, many shave their heads under the pretext of piety."[74] Though the reasons it considered these acts objectionable are not made explicit, they appear to have touched the same nerve that was sensitive to the male practice of self-castration. This is further indicated by the later *Life of Euphrosune of Alexandria.* Euphrosune secretly shaved her head and put on a monk's habit to gain access to a local monastery. At the monastery gate she presented herself as a eunuch and was accepted as such to pass many years in the company of the monks.[75] Euphrosune had symbolically castrated herself.[76] Though, unlike the eunuchs Basil condemns, Euphrosune is depicted as being innocently motivated by piety, her act was a deception nonetheless, and in the end she is revealed to the sympathetic monks as the woman she remained all along. Indeed, as Church fathers had long recognized, no bodily mark could guarantee chastity. At Carthage Cyprian had warned that even physical examination of a virgin could prove nothing,

> since the hand and the eye of the midwives may frequently be mistaken, and, besides, even if she is found to be an unsullied virgin in her private parts, she could have sinned in some other part of her person which can be sullied and yet cannot be examined.

The integrity of the hymen on the female body, like the absence of testicles on the male, could not be acknowledged as a valid proof of chaste conduct when men and women mingled in Christian communities. Watchdogs like Cyprian and Basil were all the more wary of such corporeal signifiers precisely because they were so widely accepted as valid. Far safer, Cyprian writes, that male and female virgins remain separate.[77]

---

[74] Synodal Letter, Hefele-Leclerq, *Histoire des conciles* 1,2 (Hildesheim 1973) 1031-32.

[75] *The Life of Euphrosune of Alexandria*, ed. and trans. A.S. Lewis in *Studia Sinaitica* 19 (London 1900) 53.

[76] J.E. Salisbury, *Church Fathers, Independent Virgins* (New York 1991) 104-10. This and other tales of female transvestitism are discussed by (among others) J. Anson, "The Female Transvestite in Early Monasticism: The Origin and Development of a Motif," *Viator* 5 (1974) 1-32 and E. Patlagean, "L'Histoire de la femme déguisée en moine et l'évolution de la sainteté féminine à Byzance," *Studi Medievali* 17 (1976) 597-623

[77] *Ep.* 4,3,1 (CChr.SL 3B, 20-21): *nec aliqua putet se posse hac excusatione defendi, quod inspici et probari possit an virgo sit, cum et manus obstetricum et oculus saepe fallatur. Et si incorrupta*

The early Christian fathers were challenged as to whether they would accept a literal rendering of Matthew 19:12 as the "greatest demonstration" (to use Eusebius' description of Origen's self-castration) "of faith and at the same time of self-control."[78] The Church ultimately rejected its validity for both doctrinal and social reasons. In the course of its fourth century debates concerning the definition of "orthodox" Christianity, and in the canons regulating proper Christian behavior, the Church increasingly established itself as the successor to the polis and its norms. A figure that was once used to signify the virtuous alterity of Christian communities to non-Christians became a figure of suspicious alterity within the orthodox Church itself. Radical manifestations of an ideal de-sexualization, whether realized by communal cohabitation of the sexes or by the physical act of self-castration on the part of certain individuals, became a "heretical" threat to the orthodox community. Whatever credit was given to Paul's affirmation in Galatians 3:28 that "there can be no male or female" in Christ, it was the apparent intention of orthodoxy that women remain marked as women, men as men, readily identifiable as such and separate.[79]

Graduate Group in Ancient History & Mediterranean Archeology,
341 Dwinelle Hall, University of California, *Berkeley*, CA 94720-2600

---

inventa fuerit virgo ea parte qua mulier potest esse, potuerit tamen et ex alia corporis parte peccasse quae corrumpi potest et tamen inspici non potest. Separation of sexes: 4,2,1.

[78] *H.E.* 6,8,1 (SC 41, 95): πίστεώς γε μὴν ὁμοῦ καὶ σωφροσύνης μέγιστον δεῖγμα περιέχον.

[79] I would like to thank Susanna Elm, the late Amos Funkenstein and Bill North for their constructive criticism on this paper.

THE ASIAN CONTEXT OF THE NEW PROPHECY AND OF *EPISTULA APOSTOLORUM*

BY

A. STEWART-SYKES

1 *Introduction*

The provenance of *Epistula Apostolorum* is disputed, but there has been relatively little progress since the classic positions were set out in the early years of this century by Schmidt, who favoured an Asian provenance,[1] and Bardy and Lietzmann who favoured Alexandria as a place of redaction.[2] Subsequent treatments of the subject have not added anything significant to the argument.[3] The most recent full-length study of *Epistula Apostolorum* avoids the issue altogether.[4] The aim of this article is to defend the Asian provenance of the *Epistula* by noting significant parallels between it and other Asian Christian groups, and in particular the Montanists.

We begin however with a review of the main arguments to date.

2.1 *Arguments for and against an Asian Provenance*

Schmidt's main arguments for an Asian provenance for *Epistula Apostolorum* are its strong links with the fourth Gospel and the fact that Cerinthus is the arch-heretic named.[5] He also suggests that the particular gnostic tenets with which *Epistula Apostolorum* takes issue are the denial of the resurrection

---

[1] Carl Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung* (Leipzig: TU 43 1919).

[2] Gustav Bardy, in an untitled review of Schmidt in *RB* 30 (1921) 110-134; H. Lietzmann "*Epistula Apostolorum*" (Review) *ZNW* 20 (1921) 173-176.

[3] B.J. van der Veken, "De Sensu Paschatis in Saeculo Secundo et Epistula Apostolorum," *Sacris Erudiri* 14 (1963) 5-33 arguing for Asia and Manfred Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum* (Berlin: Patristische Texte und Studien 5 1965) 99-115 arguing for Alexandria.

[4] Julian Hills, *Tradition and Composition in the Epistula Apostolorum* (Minneapolis: Fortress 1990).

[5] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 364-367.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

of Christ and docetism. This takes us to Asia since these are the very problems combated by Ignatius in his letters to Asian congregations.[6] Finally he believes that the section concerning the Pascha, which he believes to indicate a Quartodeciman background, fits an Asian milieu.[7]

Against Schmidt the following arguments may be noted. On the question of the Johannine links Hornschuh suggests that since the fourth Gospel may be Alexandrian then on this basis Alexandria is at least as likely a place for the redaction of *Epistula Apostolorum*;[8] if this is the case Cerinthus may simply have been chosen as a representative heretic who was historically known.[9] Schmidt himself at one point in his work implies this, in suggesting that the fiction of the apostolic opposition to gnosticism obliged the redactor to name heretics of the apostolic period, namely Simon and Cerinthus.[10] On the question of docetism, it is sufficient to note that this belief is not restricted to Asia.[11] Finally, with regard to the Pascha it is to be noted that no date for the Pascha is cited by the *Epistula Apostolorum*, and so the work cannot on this basis alone be claimed as Quartodeciman and therefore Asian.[12]

It is possible to defend Schmidt principally with regard to his location of *Epistula Apostolorum* in Asia on the basis of the links with the fourth Gospel and on the basis of the prominent role of Cerinthus.

In respect of attempts to locate the fourth Gospel at Alexandria one should note that at the beginning of the third century Clement, for all his admiration of *John*[13] shows no knowledge of a connection of John and Alexandria[14] whereas extensive evidence of a connection with Ephesus is collected by Schmidt, just as it has most recently been thoroughly reviewed

---

[6] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 196-7, 367.

[7] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 368-370.

[8] Hornschuh, *Studien* 100, 108-109.

[9] Hornschuh, *Studien* 99-100 following Bardy 118.

[10] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 195.

[11] As Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 367-368 himself admits. See also Bardy 130.

[12] So Lietzmann 175.

[13] It was this admiration which led Bardy 130 to suggest an Alexandrian origin to the Johannine *Epistula Apostolorum*.

[14] *Hypotyposeis* (apud Eusebius *HE* 6.14) gives no indication given that John was thought Alexandrian, whereas *Quis Dives Salvetur* 42 indicates that Clement thought of John as active in Ephesus. In this light it is difficult to sustain an Alexandrian origin to the fourth Gospel. The gnostic evidence cited by Hornschuh at *Studien* 100, which was the basis for Bardy's work likewise, is difficult to date, but liable to be considerably later than is useful.

by Hengel[15] and Bauckham,[16] both of whom come to positive conclusions concerning the historical connection of John and Ephesus.

With regard to the role of Cerinthus we may suggest that if Alexandria were the place of redaction, other heretics than Cerinthus would surely have come to mind. Schmidt notes that the first Alexandrian evidence for knowledge of Cerinthus dates from the middle of the third century.[17] Given the directly anti-gnostic bent of *Epistula Apostolorum*, the role of Cerinthus is more than being simply a representative; so van der Veken suggests that the role of Cerinthus is Schmidt's most important argument.[18] In this light we may recall Schmidt's suggestion that the anti-docetic material of *Epistula Apostolorum* recalls an Asian, and Johannine, milieu given the amount of anti-docetic material which is contained in the fourth Gospel.[19] It is true that docetism is not uniquely Asian, but nonetheless it is an issue that is particularly prominent in the Asian church.

2.2 *Arguments for and against an Alexandrian Provenance*

The positive arguments for Alexandrian origin are laid out by Hornschuh, who admits that they are variable in quality.[20] Firstly he suggests that since it is extant only in Coptic and Ethiopic this indicates that its origin was in Alexandria.[21] However the provenance of the extant witnesses is neither here nor there, since other Asian documents, for instance *Peri Pascha*, are known chiefly from Egyptian witnesses. This is a potential line of argument which Schmidt had already shown to be wanting.[22]

Hornschuh then follows Lietzmann in pointing out a significant parallel between the *Epistula Apostolorum* and the Alexandrian liturgy of St. Mark.[23] This indicates a common source, but we shall gather below a number of significant parallels between *Epistula Apostolorum* and Asian sources. Although

---

[15] Martin Hengel, *The Johannine Question*: (ETr) (London: SCM 1989).

[16] Richard Bauckham, "Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel" *JTS* (ns) 44 (1993) 24-69, 29-30.

[17] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 365.

[18] van der Veken, "De Sensu Paschatis" 14.

[19] On which see in particular Udo Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John* (ETr) (Minneapolis: Fortress 1992).

[20] Hornschuh, *Studien* 103.

[21] Hornschuh, *Studien* 103-104 (with reservations) following Lietzmann 175-176 and Bardy 130.

[22] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 364.

[23] Hornschuh, *Studien* 104.

the parallels with Asian material are more numerous than this isolated example, parallels are to be weighed rather than counted, and it is hoped to show below that the parallels between *Epistula Apostolorum* and Asian sources are of greater significance than this isolated instance. If this single parallel is to be counted as significant, one would have to discount parallels such as that which may be exhibited between the credal statement at *Epistula Apostolorum* 3 and Melito fragment 15.[24] In both Christ is stated to be the creator, as well as word, to be over the angels, to be the one who spoke through the prophets and patriarchs, and yet who was touched by the apostles and wrapped in swaddling bands. Whereas much of the common ground is biblical, the fact that in both we have a naive form of monarchianism displayed, and the fact that the same biblical incidents are alluded to, are each significant. We shall return to this christological affinity below.

Hornschuh next turns to the incidence of a number of "western" readings in the text of the *Epistula Apostolorum* such as the use of the inauthentic ending of Mark, and a number of western traditions, such as Martha being named as one of the myrrh bearers.[25] He concludes that the *Epistula Apostolorum* therefore belongs in a "römisch-ägyptischen Kreis." However nothing is known of a connection between Alexandria and Rome in the second century, indeed we are essentially ignorant about Alexandrian Christianity in this period. The close ties between the two sees come about during the fourth century, though there were some dealings in the third century. However in the second century there were close ties between Asia and Rome. Not only did Polycarp visit Rome, but there was a significant Asian population in Rome at the time which could easily be the way in which "western" tendencies, or rather tendencies which would become western, would be introduced into Roman Christianity.

After this group of arguments Hornschuh turns to arguments from the history of religions. For instance he shows links with heterodox Judaism;[26] however heterodox Judaism is not unknown in Asia. For this argument to be sustained it would be necessary to be much more precise as to the nature of the Judaism with which *Epistula Apostolorum* is engaged. The arguments

---

[24] For chapter divisions in *Epistula Apostolorum* we use those provided in the German translation in Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 25-155. The text employed where possible is Schmidt's Coptic text, though comparison with the (translated) Ethiopic is inevitable where the Coptic is wanting. The fragments of Melito follow the numbering of S.G. Hall, *Melito of Sardis: Peri Pascha and Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon 1979).

[25] Hornschuh, *Studien* 105-107.

[26] Hornschuh, *Studien* 111-112, who suggests that heterodox Judaism points to Alexandria.

of Lietzmann, Bardy and Hornschuh derive from a fundamental conviction that Egypt is the natural home of gnosticism, which is in turn related to the Johannine writings.[27] In the light of recent research this conviction is far from certain.[28] Cerinthus at least is Asian.[29]

2.3 *Interim Conclusions*

There are thus some grounds for upholding an Asian origin, but they are not altogether certain, since the same arguments may be employed to suggest an origin elsewhere. The situation is confused as *Epistula Apostolorum*, besides its Johannine links, would seem to have links with a number of Christian traditions; the complexity of the traditions lying behind *Epistula Apostolorum* is noted and exploited by Hornschuh. One should note as an example of this complexity that the list of apostles in *Epistula Apostolorum* 3, in which Peter and Cephas are treated as separate apostles, pointed towards an Alexandrian milieu, given that it holds this trait in common with the apostolic church order.[30] However, van der Veken suggests that if *Epistula Apostolorum* predates the lists with which Bardy makes comparison, then these other lists may be seen as dependent upon *Epistula Apostolorum*[31] and thus does not prevent an Asian provenance.

The argument is at a stalemate. As we noted above Hills does not study the question of the place of origin to *Epistula Apostolorum*, but what emerges from his study is the strong Johannine flavour of the work,[32] and a situation of persecution,[33] which would point to Asia, though once again not exclusively so.

---

[27] Hornschuh, *Studien* 107-108.

[28] See most recently Michael Waldstein, "The Providence Monologue in the Apocryphon of John and the Johannine Prologue," *JECS* 3 (1995) 369-402.

[29] So Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (ETr) (San Francisco: Harper 1987) 165, 298-299 with reference to Irenaeus *AH* 1.26.

[30] As Bardy 116 points out.

[31] van der Veken, "De Sensu Paschatis" 21-23.

[32] See especially his comment at *Tradition* 161, where he speaks of the "marked, if not pervasive, Johannine character of much of the author's language and theology."

[33] Hills, *Tradition* 114.

3 *Epistula Apostolorum and Asian Christianities*

The object of this paper is to break the impasse by suggesting that there are significant parallels in thought and background between *Epistula Apostolorum* and the new prophecy. Given that the Asian origin of "Montanism" is not in doubt, the extent of these parallels may serve to support the hypothesis of an Asian origin to *Epistula Apostolorum*. If strong links are established with the new prophecy not only does this provide a context in which to view the uncertain arguments of Hornschuh, but those of Schmidt may emerge with renewed force, and further indications of common ground with Asian Christianity may moreover be brought into play. We hope to establish common ground between Montanist and non-Montanist Asian Christianity and *Epistula Apostolorum* on the basis of a common christology and a common eschatology, on the basis of a common set of attitudes towards prophecy, on the basis of a common set of attitudes towards gnosticism and on the basis of common paschal practice. These all, we suggest, arise out of the setting of Asian Christianity that each have in common, and that the Johannine writings underpin much of this common ground.

That the new prophecy arose in Asia is not a coincidence. Trevett establishes a number of links between Asian theological issues, derived from the Ignatian correspondence, and those issues which became prominent in the Montanist crisis, namely an interest in prophecy and prophetic authority and ascetic practices including fasting and chastity.[34] Trevett also notes an acquaintance with the realities of martyrdom, and eager eschatological expectation as realities of Christian existence in Asia. Again, these latter issues are not exclusively Asian, but it remains a fact that their presence in Asia at the time of Ignatius are intimations of what would happen in the Montanist movement. Ignatius intends to lend some order to a somewhat diffuse Asian Christianity in view of the gnostic challenge; we may here note that something similar is attempted by *Epistula Apostolorum*.[35] Montanism did not only derive from theological factors within Asia, but social factors likewise played a role.[36] The new prophecy is then a valuable

---

[34] C. Trevett, "Apocalypse, Ignatius, Montanism: seeking the seeds," *VigChr* 43 (1989) 313-338.

[35] Hills, *Tradition* 143.

[36] See D.H. Williams, "The Origins of the Montanist Movement: a Sociological Analysis," *Religion* 19 (1989) 331-351.

source for understanding Asian Christianity in the latter half of the second century. With this in mind we may investigate the parallels between *Epistula Apostolorum* and the new prophecy.

3.1 *Common Liturgical Practice*

3.1.1 Epistula Apostolorum *and the Montanists as Quartodecimans*

We may begin by observing parallels in paschal practice. We have noted that no date is given for the Pascha by *Epistula Apostolorum*, and on that basis its Quartodeciman provenance has been denied. However there are other indications of Quartodeciman practice. One should note that the arrangements for the paschal fast state that the fast should continue until midnight. This is clearly distinct from the Roman practice of fasting until the ninth hour[37] but it corresponds to the Montanist practice of extending fasts.[38] Fasting arrangements for Montanists and the community of the *Epistula Apostolorum* cohere, and may each be seen to belong to a common Quartodeciman heritage.

However, here we must show that the Montanists were Quartodeciman. Apart from the intrinsic probability of such a fact in view of the Montanists' Asian origins Hippolytus' complaint that "strange fasts" were instituted by the Montanists, and that fasting might take place on the Lord's day[39] may well be seen as reactions to Quartodeciman practice, since the problem of fasting on the Lord's Day was certainly a major issue in the Quartodeciman controversy. We may also note the peculiar arrangements for the keeping of the Pascha reported by Sozomen.[40] Whereas these may conceivably have derived from Judaism, as suggested by Ford,[41] all sound like survivals of Quartodeciman paschal practice. In this light we may note that Pacian writes of the confusion caused by Montanists "de paschali die,"[42] and Filastrius writes of the sending from Pepuza of a "sacrificium" mixed with the blood of an infant "satellitibus," that is to say to the sur-

---

[37] Tertullian, *De Jejun.* 15.

[38] Tertullian, *De Jejun.* 10.

[39] Hippolytus, *Comm. in Dan.* 4.20.

[40] Sozomen, *HE* 7.18.12-14 at Ronald E. Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia* (Macon GA: NAPSPMS 14 1989) 168.

[41] J. Massingberd Ford, "Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian Heresy?," *JEH* 17 (1966) 145-158 at 148-149.

[42] Pacian, *Epistola ad Sympronianum* I at Heine, *Oracles* 136.

rounding Montanist congregations.[43] Although clearly confused, this is reminiscent of the sending of the fermentum from the paschal eucharist at Rome which was clearly accepted by the Quartodeciman congregations in Rome.[44] In keeping with the Asian tradition the Montanists were Quartodeciman.[45]

Paulsen however thinks it improbable that the Montanist paschal arrangements are Quartodeciman, or derived in any way from Judaism as the Quartodeciman practice was, since the Montanists would appear to be keeping a solar Pascha whereas that of the Jews was lunar.[46] But already in the second century there is some confusion over the basis of the calculation of Pascha as a result of the flexibility of the time both of beginning and breaking the paschal fast;[47] in addition there were attempts among Asians in Rome to combine the Jewish paschal calendar with the solar calendar,[48] and it is not impossible that the same in time happened in Asia itself. As Christians become more distanced from Jews one might expect the extent of the confusion to be increased and the attempts to reconcile lunar and solar calendars to become more frequent. The evidence of Sozomen is of such a date that one may expect that there had been some development from the earlier days of Montanism.

Not only the paschal fast of the *Epistula Apostolorum* but the paschal celebration likewise may be seen as Quartodeciman when viewed in the light of Montanist practice. It is in the light of Montanist Quartodecimanism that we may read the report of Epiphanius of virgins carrying torches in Montanist worship. Kraft, whilst noting that any report of Epiphanius has to be treated with some caution, believes that nonetheless it has a core of reliability.[49] Powell suggests that this "ritual and liturgical innovation" can

---

[43] *Diversarum Haereseon Liber* 49 at Heine, *Oracles* 138.

[44] According to Irenaeus at Eusebius, *HE* 5.24.

[45] The possibility is briefly noted by F.E. Vokes, "The Opposition to Montanism from Church and State in the Christian Empire," *StPatr* 4 (TU79) (Berlin: Akademie 1961) 518-526, at 524.

[46] H. Paulsen, "Die Bedeutung des Montanismus für die Herausbildung des Kanons," *VigChr* 32 (1978) 19-52, 48-49.

[47] On which see especially B. Lohse, *Das Passahfest der Quartodecimaner* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann 1953) 48-53.

[48] On which see Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century* (Leiden: Brill 1995) 63-69.

[49] Heinz Kraft, "Die altkirchliche Prophetie und die Entstehung des Montanismus," *ThZ* 11 (1955) 249-271, at 257 with reference to Epiphanius, *Panarion* 49.2.

hardly be authentic or original, since it goes without criticism in the earliest sources.[50] However all of this is in conformity with the paschal celebrations of mainstream Christianity in Asia, with the burning of torches accompanying the paschal fast as it is brought to its conclusion at around midnight. It is not criticized because it is not innovatory. A common interest between Montanism and *Epistula Apostolorum* in the parable of the virgins may be noted in this context; the basis of this interest may lie in the eschatological import of the original parable, tied as it is to Pascha. We may thus follow the suggestion of Huber that *Epistula Apostolorum* 43 has a liturgical *Sitz im Leben*,[51] and see the Montanist practice of which Epiphanius tells us in the same light, as normal Asian paschal practice.

We have suggested that the fact that a date is not cited by *Epistula Apostolorum* for Pascha does not prevent us seeing it as coming from a Quartodeciman background. A date is not cited because it is unnecessary; in Asia it is assumed that the Pascha falls on the fourteenth of Nisan. On the basis of a Johannine chronology the Pascha of the *Epistula Apostolorum* is a commemoration of the death of the Lord.[52]

3.1.2 *Epistula Apostolorum, Montanism, and Prophecy*

Since the Quartodecimans themselves had their prophets, notably Melito, Polycarp and the daughters of Philip, and many of these prophets were claimed by orthodox Asian Christians and Montanists alike, we are thus led to compare the attitude of prophecy within Asian Christianity to that exhibited by the *Epistula Apostolorum*.

The first point of comparison may be found in the use of Scripture by *Epistula Apostolorum*. We have noted already both the Johannine character of the letter as well as the fact that there are other scriptural citations beside *John* worked into the text. On this basis Schmidt suggests that the redactor was an officeholder in the church.[53] Certainly he is a preacher, and the use of scripture may thereby be seen not as the attempt to create a pious fiction but rather as an exercise in charismatic exegesis. He is a

---

[50] Douglas Powell, "Tertullianists and Cataphrygians," *VigChr* 29 (1975) 33-54, 46-7.

[51] W. Huber, *Passa und Ostern: Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche* (Berlin: BZNW 35 1969) 212.

[52] So Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 579, 611, with reference to *Epistula Apostolorum* 26. Bardy 130 argues that although the Pascha of the *Epistula Apostolorum* would appear to be a commemoration centred upon the death of Christ, this in itself does not mean that it is Quartodeciman.

[53] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 214.

preacher in that he is a prophet,[54] and an exegete likewise by virtue of his prophetic gift.[55] Thus there was a complex relationship between the community which produced *Epistula Apostolorum* to the canonical New Testament. This redactor feels free to shape the canonical texts and traditions in his own context and situation. This mirrors the practice of the Montanists.

Further evidence of the prophetic origin of *Epistula Apostolorum* may be discerned in the form of the document; it is a *Sendschreibe*, a form also employed by Montanists. A particular charge made against the Montanists by later critics was that they produced literature of their own and in particular collections of prophecies.[56] *Epistula Apostolorum* may be seen as such an example of a collection of prophecies. In form, having an epistolary basis, it may be compared to the καθολικὴ ἐπιστολή of Themiso.[57] We do not know what the content of the letter of Themiso actually was, though it is a reasonable assumption that it consisted of a collection of prophecies.

Walls however disputes this; he speculates that it was an attempt to "confirm the old message in the new situation," and doubts that Themiso was himself a prophet or that he claimed to be inspired.[58] His intention is to point out the extent to which the "canonical" Scriptures were treasured in Montanism, and this is what leads him to his assertions here. However, this conception of canon seems somewhat anachronous for the second century; it is quite possible for the Montanists to treasure canonical Scripture, and to produce inspired writings of their own, just as did the redactor of *Epistula Apostolorum*. "Confirming the old message in the new situation" may indeed be seen as a work of prophecy.

---

[54] For prophecy as preaching see in particular David Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (London: Marshall Morgan and Scott 1979) 101-103.

[55] For exegesis as a prophetic activity in second century Asia see Dennis E. Groh, "Utterance and Exegesis: Biblical Interpretation in the Montanist Crisis," *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*. Ed. D.E. Groh and Robert Jewett (Lanham MD: University Press of America 1985) 73-95. Also Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University 1996) 80-86 for some further examples of charismatic exegesis in the oracles. Scripture and prophecy are not natural foes. As James L. Ash, "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church," *Theological Studies* 37 (1976) 227-252 points out it is not the canon which leads to the decline of prophecy in the church.

[56] Hippolytus, *Ref.* 8.19.1, 5; Eusebius, *HE* 6.20.3, Theodoret, *Haer. Fab. Comp.* 3.2.

[57] Apollonius at Eusebius, *HE* 5.18.5.

[58] A.F. Walls, "The Montanist 'Catholic Epistle' and its New Testament Prototype," *Studia Evangelica* 3 (Berlin: TU 88 1964) 437-443, 442.

An argument in support of seeing Themiso's epistle along the lines of *Epistula Apostolorum* may be garnered from Apollonius' words that Themiso was μιμούμενος τὸν ἀπόστολον. Walls argues that Themiso is imitating the apostle (in Asia surely John, or perhaps *I Peter*, is intended, not Paul as Trevett suggests)[59] in that he is sending out an epistle. However he does note that μιμέομαι may be used indicating theatrical performance.[60] μίμησις was however known beyond the theatre, it was a fundamental skill of rhetoric to make present a scene to the minds of the hearers through μίμησις, ἠθοποιΐα being part of this.[61] That is to say, Themiso could well have been writing *as* the apostle, in conformity with the Asian rhetorical practice of ēthopoiia.[62] Although it is impossible not to speculate in the absence of any copy of Themiso's epistle, it is quite probable that it was a collection of prophecies cast into epistolatory form (not a "real" letter, since it is καθολική). As such we may see that in propagating their material in this way the Montanists were acting no differently from other Asian Christians in the second century.

Whether or not this was the form of the epistle of Themiso, in the case of *Epistula Apostolorum* the form of an epistle is simply the basis for a collection of speeches by the risen Christ.[63] Schmidt refers to these as a "Fiktion," but the fictional setting lies in the address to the apostles, rather than in the epistolatory form, which is a purely external phenomenon. *Epistula Apostolorum*, in view of the prophetic interest of the work, should be viewed as a collection of prophecies, given in the name of the risen Christ.

Further evidence of this may be adduced by reference to the formal similarities with the Shepherd of Hermas displayed by *Epistula Apostolorum*. There is a similar procedure by which answers are elicited from the revelatory figure by means of questions, a similarity which greatly impressed

---

[59] Trevett, *Montanism* 130.

[60] Walls, "Montanist 'Catholic Epistle'" 440.

[61] See in particular D.A. Russell, *Criticism in Antiquity* (London: Duckworth 1981) 108-110.

[62] Note the similar approach of Kurt Aland, "The Problem of Anonymity and Pseudonymity in Christian Literature of the First Two Centuries," *JTS* (ns) 12 (1961) 39-49. We may further ground this is the Asian context by noting the manner in which Melito, himself a prophet, takes on the *persona* of Christ at the conclusion of his *Peri Pascha*.

[63] So Schmidt recognises this as a catholic epistle, but suggests that this is the superficial form only. Hills, *Tradition* 11-14 shows that the epistolatory form is more than superficial, but suggests that this is really the springboard for a series of "brief expositions." He goes on to suggest that the intention in gathering these discourses is catechetical, but his grounds for this suggestion are not strong.

Schmidt. Hills however notes a similar situation with regard to gnostic dialogues, though he notes the simplicity of the narrative framework, to which he finds the closest parallel to be not gnostic but Jewish, namely *II Baruch*.[64] One exception to the simplicity of the dialogue, the disciples' interjection of grief at those who had fallen asleep, is, Hills suggests, sanctioned by the dialogue form, in that Hermas makes a similar interjection. Similarly the invitation of the revealer to enquire, the rebuke of the revealer and the approval of the revealer, together with the apology of the recipient combined with approval of what they hear Hills shows to be part of the standard repertoire of the dialogue of this sort, and thus displays parallels with Hermas, as with other "revelation dialogues."[65]

The point of stressing the dialogic construction of *Epistula Apostolorum* is to emphasize that the essential content is revelation, that is to say prophecy. This is established by Hills through his isolation of the redactional content between the discourses; on this basis we may see the discourses as prophetic discourses. Once again the parallels with Hermas may be observed since Hermas is likewise a series of prophetic revelations; it may thus be suggested that rather than being an imitation of the gnostic revelation dialogue,[66] a dialogue is the means by which in primitive Christianity a revelation report should be made. This in turn leads us to see the manner in which the Christ of the fourth Gospel gives his extended speeches in a dialogical setting, often in response to questions from the disciples. These too may perhaps be seen as prophetic revelations, here put into the mouth not of the risen Christ but of the earthly Jesus. In the same way as the Johannine disciples so those of *Epistula Apostolorum* are to preach and proclaim.

The prophetic practice of the *Epistula Apostolorum* may thus be grounded in its Johannine tradition. Here Hills[67] discerns a departure from the Johannine tradition in that the spirit in *John* is the means not of preaching but of teaching, and in that here it is not the spirit but the risen Christ which is the source of authority. However, the use of the term παράκλητος in *John* is a functional indicator; preaching, παράκλησις, is the work of the spirit par excellence.[68] Moreover the Spirit in Johannine theology is in fact

---

[64] Hills, *Tradition* 17.

[65] Hills, *Tradition* 22-23, 27-28.

[66] A suggestion canvassed by Hills, *Tradition* 16.

[67] Hills, *Tradition* 123.

[68] Understanding the term παράκλησις as prophetic preaching with Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* 101-103.

the alter ego of the risen Jesus;[69] as such the spirit is Christ, who is indeed the source of the authority of the *Epistula Apostolorum* as in his risen presence he addresses us through his apostles.

Thus for *Epistula Apostolorum* the risen Christ is the sole source of authority, and all sources named are themselves prophetic.[70] As such *Epistula Apostolorum* may be seen as displaying the same "I" form of the word of prophecy which is exhibited by the extant Montanist oracles. Thus although prophecy as a theme is not addressed in *Epistula Apostolorum* it is present simply in that the epistle is a collection of prophecies. It is not addressed as an issue simply because the honoured place of prophecy is not an issue in Asian Christianity. It is assumed that the apostles will preach and prophesy,[71] and they are given peace and spirit and power to prophesy.[72] This in turn reminds us of Maximilla's statement that God was ῥῆμα . . . καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις.[73] The prophets of Montanism and of *Epistula Apostolorum* share a common daimon, and this would appear to have been shared moreover with Melito and the daughters of Philip, among others. Thus we may note that Asian Christianity, including Montanism, and *Epistula Apostolorum* have a common attitude towards the practice of prophecy which is grounded in the Johannine tradition.

3.1.3 *Montanism*, Epistula Apostolorum *and Johannine Prophetic Christianity*

At this point it is necessary to defend this statement of a relationship between Montanism and the Johannine literature since the Johannine basis of Asian Montanism, once held to be proven,[74] has been questioned in

---

[69] So Stephen Smalley, *John: Evangelist and Interpreter* (Exeter: Paternoster 1978) 232 summarizing much previous discussion, notably R.E. Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 13 (1967) 113-131. Also note John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon 1991) 420-425.

[70] Hills, *Tradition* 31.

[71] *Epistula Apostolorum* 23.

[72] *Epistula Apostolorum* 30.

[73] Oracle 5, following here and throughout the numbering of Heine *Oracles*. Groh, "Utterance and Exegesis" 79 suggests that this oracle may be inspired by I Cor. 2:4. However, it is strange to find the New Testament treated as scriptural in this way during the second century. More likely candidates are *Psalm* 32:6 (LXX) τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν, or in view of the context yet more probably, *Psalm* 67:12 (LXX) Κύριος δώσει ῥῆμα τοῖς εὐαγγελιζομένοις δυνάμει πολλῇ.

[74] So see Kurt Aland, "Bemerkungen zum Montanismus und zur frühchristlichen

particular by Heine.[75] Heine argues that references to the paraclete seem to come from a western setting, and this, together with the canonizing movement indicated by the Muratorian Canon indicate that it was at Rome that the justification of new revelation with reference to *John* came about. Moreover he points out that in the surviving records of the Asian debate about Montanism there is no apparent recourse to the paraclete passages of *John* 14-16, rather the debate centred around the question of true and false prophecy. "If the paraclete passages held . . . significance for the earliest Montanists . . . it is inexplicable how an author who goes into such detail to refute the Montanists' appeal to Genesis 2:21 and other Scriptures referring to ecstatic prophecy could pass over in silence those very passages to which they allegedly appealed to justify their existence as prophets."[76]

Against Heine it must first be noted that the second century origin of the Muratorian fragment is not established, and thus this vital piece of evidence concerning the attitude to canonicity at Rome must be discounted.[77] Secondly we must question Heine's reconstruction of the attitude of the Roman church as being that there could be no prophecy at all; in this event it should be asked why and how Hermas was held in esteem. In fact those who sought to deny prophecy were only a group within the Roman church.[78] Finally, to turn to the Asian debate, there is in fact some reflection of debate about the paraclete in the Asian context at *Panarion* 48.2. However, as Trevett points out, in Asia it would not be necessary to debate the role of the paraclete, since the recognition of the paraclete's role in prophecy is undisputed.[79] So it is that *Epistula Apostolorum* knows of the paraclete, and this is the most natural term for the Spirit;[80] we have observed already that the paraclete in *Epistula Apostolorum* is indeed the spirit of prophecy.

Finally it should be noted that Heine assumes that *John* is canonical scripture in the same way that Genesis is. There is no certainty about this;

Eschatologie," *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh: Mohn 1960) 105-148, especially 129-132.

[75] R.E. Heine, "The Role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy," *SCent* 6 (1987-1988) 1-19.

[76] Heine, "Gospel of John" 10.

[77] See G.M. Hahnemann, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon 1992).

[78] A. Stewart-Sykes, "Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 5: a Prophetic Protest from Second Century Rome," *StPatr* (Leuven: Peeters) forthcoming.

[79] Trevett, *Montanism* 92-95; also 63-65.

[80] *Epistula Apostolorum* 5.

the Montanist prophecy may stand in the Johannine tradition without necessarily appealing to Johannine texts to justify itself; the appeal to texts notwithstanding, Melito indicates an extensive acquaintance with Johannine theology, though not with the Johannine literature. Might not a similar phenomenon have been visible in Montanism, with the Johannine prophetic tradition continuing even despite the absence of any apparent scriptural basis?

This Johannine background explains much that *Epistula Apostolorum* holds in common with Montanism since, as we have seen, Schmidt's characterisation of the Christianity of *Epistula Apostolorum* as Johannine has been borne out by Hills.[81] This common Johannine background is Asian. The Johannine picture of the Christian prophet[82] is moreover a picture of the origins of *Epistula Apostolorum*.

3.2 *Common Theological Themes*

3.2.1 Epistula Apostolorum, *the New Prophecy and anti-gnostic Christology*

Having shown that the practice of the new prophecy coheres with that of *Epistula Apostolorum* we may turn to examine theological parallels. For Schmidt the essence of *Epistula Apostolorum* is that it is anti-gnostic; Oracle 9, attributed to Priscilla, shows a similarly stark anti-gnostic bent,[83] and Oracle 8 is likewise patient of an anti-gnostic interpretation;[84] we may thus enquire whether the theology of the new prophecy was in essence similarly anti-gnostic.

However, before proceeding we should define the gnosticism opposed by *Epistula Apostolorum* a little more closely. We have noted with Schmidt that an anti-docetic tendency may be observed in the document, but also that Cerinthus is named as a heretic. Docetism, which is here defined as a belief that Jesus Christ was not truly in the flesh but simply an appearance,[85]

---

[81] See e.g. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 224-226, 231-241; Hills *Tradition* 161.

[82] Drawn out by M.E. Boring, "The Influence of Christian Prophecy on the Johannine Portrayal of the Paraclete and Jesus," *NTS* 25 113-123.

[83] So Trevett, *Montanism* 163.

[84] Trevett, *Montanism* 166.

[85] Following the working definition proposed by Schnelle *Antidocetic Christology* 64-65. The definition of docetism is, as Schnelle points out, a difficult question. See in particular A.K.M. Adam, Article "Docetism" in the *Early Church Online Encyclopaedia* (http://www.evansville.edu/~ecoleweb/articles/docetism.html) and refs.

was clearly a problem in Asia, and may broadly be described as gnostic. However Cerinthus was not in this sense a docetist. Rather, for him, Jesus was a man entirely separate from Christ, which may be described as a spiritual principle.[86]

Epistula Apostolorum may in fact be perceived as opposing not only docetism but also the christology of Cerinthus, with its constant insistence that the Lord is Jesus Christ[87] and with its credal statement that the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is God.[88]

Both of these positions may moreover be perceived as being opposed by the Johannine literature. Not only is there a strong anti-docetic element in *I John*,[89] *I John* 2:22 opposes those who do not believe that Jesus is the Christ, and *John* 20:31 states that book is written to show that Jesus is indeed the Christ.[90] Although there is no absolute certainty that Cerinthus is directly intended here, it is certainly possible, in view of the later opposition to this figure from within the Johannine school.

Those who deny that Cerinthus is intended argue from the Johannine silence about other key elements in Cerinthus' system, such as the existence of a higher and a lower God and the rejection of a salvific death upon the cross.[91] However, once it is established that Jesus is indeed the Christ, the Son of God, the rest of the Cerinthian system falls. *I John* moreover speaks of the saving effects of Christ's death.[92] *I John* is not primarily polemical,[93] and so we should not expect too precise a definition of the position of the "heretics," which would in any event be known to those who receive the letter.

---

[86] All our information on Cerinthus is gathered from Irenaeus *AH* 1.26.

[87] See especially the repeated formula at *Epistula Apostolorum* 1 in the context of opposition to Cerinthus.

[88] *Epistula Apostolorum* 3.

[89] In addition to the anti-docetism in the fourth Gospel, noted above following Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology*, see in particular *I John* 1:1. Judith Lieu *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles* (Cambridge: CUP 1991) 14-15, 75-78, denies that this passage is anti-docetic but fails to take account of the further anti-docetic material within the corpus.

[90] It may also be pointed out that Jews do not accept that Jesus is the Christ; but Jews are clearly not intended here, since, according to *I John* 2:19 the "heretics" have been part of the Johannine community.

[91] Such is the basis on which Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology* 70, rejects Cerinthus as a candidate for being a Johannine opponent. The most balanced discussion is that of Stephen S. Smalley, *1,2,3 John* (Waco: Word Biblical Commentary 51 1984) 111-113.

[92] *I John* 5:6. See also the discussion by Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology* 68.

[93] So Lieu, *Theology* 15-16.

It would therefore appear that both docetism and Cerinthian christology, or an earlier version of the direction of thought which would be adopted by Cerinthus, are distinct but contemporary manifestations in Asia and are both equally opposed from within the Johannine school. They are not mutually exclusive,[94] nor does the fact that *I John* is in part concerned to combat those who separate Jesus from the Christ prevent the elder having an eye on docetists as well. Both of these groups are subsumed under the title "gnostic" here for the sake of convenience, though it should be remembered that two systems are in fact in evidence.

We may thus begin this theological enquiry by noting a common christology underlying Montanist and non-Montanist Asian Christianity and *Epistula Apostolorum* deriving from the Johannine tradition. This christology is given an anti-docetic and anti-Cerinthian turn. In particular the anti-gnostic tenor of *Epistula Apostolorum* emerges in the fact that the Christ of *Epistula Apostolorum* is the *logos* who became flesh.[95] The christology as such is starkly opposed both to docetism and, by stressing that the Word was indeed identical with the flesh, is starkly opposed to the christology of Cerinthus. This anti-docetic christology is entrenched in the Asian tradition; to the incarnational kerygma of *Epistula Apostolorum* 3 one may compare that of Polycarp at *Smyrn.* 1.1.

The statement of Montanus that the Lord God παντοκράτωρ dwelt in a man may likewise be seen as having a similarly anti-gnostic bent, being a clear statement of the reality of the godhead in its involvement with the human world.[96] An identical christology, stressing the extent of the unity between Christ and the Father may be noted at *Epistula Apostolorum* 17, ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲧⲏⲣⲧ ϯⲣⲛ̄ ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲁⲟⲩ ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ⲣⲏⲧ (I am wholly in the Father and the Father in me). The common ground between Montanism and *Epistula Apostolorum* here is surely provided by the Johannine context of Asian Christianity. It is the same christology, based on the oneness of God the Father and God the Word which appears in Melito,[97] and indeed in Noetus of Smyrna.[98] So it is that Hippolytus accuses the Montanists

---

[94] As Smalley, *1,2,3 John* 113 appears to think.

[95] Note especially Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 294-298.

[96] Montanus, Fragment 1.

[97] On which see S.G. Hall, "The Christology of Melito: a Misrepresentation Exposed," *StPatr* 13 (Berlin: TU 116 1975) 154-168. Note also our comments in the comparison made above between *Epistula Apostolorum* 3 and Melito fragment 15. Melito's christology may likewise be seen as anti-gnostic. So R. Cantalamessa, "Méliton de Sardes, une christologie anti-gnostique du II[e] siècle," *RevSR* 37 (1963) 1-26.

[98] So Reinhard M. Hübner, "Melito von Sardes und Noët von Smyrna, *Oecumenica*

of being Noetians;[99] rather than being Noetian, the Montanists share with Noetus, Melito and *Epistula Apostolorum* a traditional Asian christology, and by extension a traditional Asian trinitarian theology, based on a Christ-Father modalism. It was the subsequent isolation of Montanism which froze this older theology and so led to Montanists of the third century being technically heretical.[100]

As a final observation on this oracle, and on the language employed here, one should note the common use of the term παντοκράτωρ here and in *Epistula Apostolorum*. It is not uniquely Asian, but is nonetheless a common Asian designation for God the Father in the second century among Jews as well as Christians.[101] Once again the extent of the cohesion between Montanism and Asian Christianity stands out, and links in with *Epistula Apostolorum*.

3.2.2 Epistula Apostolorum, *the New Prophecy, and Eschatology*

Likewise in its eschatological attitudes *Epistula Apostolorum* shows a high degree of conformity with Asian Christianity, and so with the new prophecy.[102] For Schmidt the eschatology of *Epistula Apostolorum* is anti-gnostic.[103] Its stress is on the actual return of Christ, and Christ moreover in the flesh. He goes on to compare the chiliasm of *Epistula Apostolorum* to that of Melito, Papias, Irenaeus, and indeed Montanism.[104] He argues that this supports his theory of an Asian origin to the document. Certainly this may enable us to place *Epistula Apostolorum* in Asia, since there is much evidence of pre-millenarianism, for which Crutchfield argues Asia was an effective incubator.[105] For Crutchfield this explains the eschatological fervour of Montanus.

---

et Patristica Ed. D. Papeandrou, W.A. Bienert, K. Schläferdiek (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1989) 220-223.

[99] *Ref.* 10.26.

[100] Rather than Montanist heresy resulting from speculative theology which resulted from isolation as Trevett, *Montanism* 223, suggests. The speculative theology which Trevett notes is all from a later period than the third century.

[101] See Paul Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: SNTSMS 69 1991) 208. Trevett, *Montanism* 81 notes the occurrence of the term in *Revelation*.

[102] Georg Schöllgen, "Tempus in Collecto est: Tertullian, der frühe Montanismus und die Naherwartung ihrer Zeit," *JAC* 27/28 (1984-1985) 74-96, at 79-80 notes the similarity without linking them directly, perhaps because he is apparently following Hornschuh in giving the *Epistula Apostolorum* an Alexandrian provenance.

[103] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 336-337.

[104] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 355.

[105] Larry G. Crutchfield, "The Apostle John and Asia Minor as a source of Pre-millennialism in the Early Church Fathers," *JEvThS* 31 (1988) 411-427.

However, there has in recent times been some revision of thinking concerning the extent to which Montanism was originally an eschatological cult;[106] certainly there is no imminent end anticipated in the most reliable oracles, nor do contemporary sources say anything of this, except in respect of one oracle of Maximilla. However this is not to say that the new prophecy did not have a futuristic eschatology from the beginning, indeed it would be unusual if did not. It is an attitude shared with other Asian Christians,[107] and as such it is to be found in *Epistula Apostolorum*. Because it is an eschatology which is in conformity with normative Asian Christianity it is not remarked upon by its contemporary critics. However Asian eschatology is more complex than can be summed up simply as "chiliasm."

Epistula Apostolorum 33 thus looks forward to the hope of a new Jerusalem, as the fulfilment of an otherwise unknown prophecy. This is reminiscent of Oracle 11, attributed to an otherwise unknown Quintilla stating that Jerusalem is to descend in Phrygia, or perhaps that it is Jerusalem; this is to be seen as deriving from a later period of Montanist development[108] but even here it may be seen that this is a development based on earlier Asian eschatological reflection. The earlier Montanists were chiliasts, in conformity with the normative Asian Christianity of the time, and part of this belief included a lively belief in the descent of Jerusalem. Although our primary witness here is Tertullian,[109] we may also note with Trevett that the new prophets' familiarity with *Revelation* and indeed *IV Ezra* would indicate a familiarity with millennial tradition.[110]

Montanus had in fact named two villages "Jerusalem."[111] The reason for this is unclear; traditionally this is linked up to the prophecy of Quintilla and considered to be eschatological in intent,[112] though this is questioned by Powell and Tabbernee, who argue that it is organisational in intent.[113] Some additional support for this view of Jerusalem as a functional indicator may be gathered from the report of the anonymous that Montanus

---

[106] Note especially Powell, "Tertullianists"; William Tabbernee, "Revelation 21 and the Montanist New Jerusalem," *AustBR* 37 (1989) 52-60.

[107] Powell, "Tertullianists" 48, 50.

[108] So Tabbernee, "Revelation 21," Powell, "Tertullianists" notably 43-44, Trevett, *Montanism* 167-168.

[109] *Adversus Marcionem* 3.23.3-4.

[110] Trevett, *Montanism* 98-99.

[111] So Apollonius at Eusebius, *HE* 5.18.

[112] So e.g. Kraft, "Altkirchliche Prophetie" 260-264, and especially Aland, "Bemerkungen" 121-122.

[113] Powell, "Tertullianists" 44; Tabbernee, "Revelation 21."

first received his revelations at a place called Ardabav.[114] As Preuschen points out, this report is at second hand, the anonymous does not know where Ardabav is; that is because it the name is taken from *IV Ezra*, and is intended to mean a place of revelation.[115] Biblical names are provided for Asian places which perform a function parallel to those performed by biblical places, but the fact that Ardabav is taken from an apocalyptic work indicates the pregnant possibility of this renaming becoming the basis for an eschatological interpretation; the same happened to the Montanist Jerusalem, a development hardly surprising in the light of the importance which Jerusalem plays in the eschatology of the Apocalypse.

Powell thus goes on to suggest that this becomes the basis for the prophecy of Quintilla since she perceives that "since Pepuza, and indeed Tymion as well, were already Jerusalem, they constituted a kind of Montanist Bethel, and the heavenly Jerusalem was already present to those whose eyes were opened."[116] Tabbernee disputes this interpretation on the grounds that there is no other evidence of realised eschatology in Montanism. He proposes that this oracle should be read as futuristic eschatology which has come about through a literalistic reading of *Revelation* 21.[117] But in fact a view of Pepuza and Tymion as "a kind of Montanist Bethel" is in conformity with the manner in which *Epistula Apostolorum* conceives of Jerusalem as the spreading of the Christian faith, the realisation of God's promises.

However, alongside this realised eschatology *Epistula Apostolorum* sustains a futuristic eschatology as well.[118] The same tension may be found in Melito[119] and indeed in the fourth Gospel,[120] and so it is not impossible that both Tabbernee and Powell may be right. That is to say that Asian Christianity sustained a lively futuristic eschatological hope whilst recognising that the signs of the parousia of Christ were already present. It is

---

[114] Apud Eusebius, *HE* 5.16.

[115] Originally suggested by E. Preuschen, "Ardaf: IV Esra 9,26 und der Montanismus," *ZNW* 1 (1900) 265-266; now supported by Trevett, *Montanism* 25-26.

[116] Powell, "Tertullianists" 45.

[117] Tabbernee, "Revelation 21" 58-59.

[118] So compare *Epistula Apostolorum* 33 and 18.

[119] So Hall, *Melito* xliv-xlv.

[120] See Smalley, *John* 236-241 and references, supplemented by Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology* 56-57 and references. This tension is well summed up in the statement that ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. We do not explore here the possibility that there have been several editions of *John* embracing contradictory positions, but simply interpret the text as it stands, representing the tensions within the tradition.

not that a realised eschatology came about as a result of the failure of the futuristic hope, rather it was present in the theological tradition all along.[121] It is on the basis of a distinction between futuristic eschatology (represented by *Epistula Apostolorum*) and realised eschatology (represented by Melito's *Peri Pascha*) that Hornschuh suggested that *Epistula Apostolorum* might be deemed not Quartodeciman.[122] But if we perceive that Asian Christianity could contain both aspects of eschatology simultaneously then we may see that the difference between Melito and *Epistula Apostolorum* is a difference of emphasis only.

The development of Montanist eschatology is thus in continuity with its roots in Asian Christianity. The fact that Quintilla prophesies of the presence of Jerusalem in the third century is fully in accordance with the other evidence of a renewal or eschatological expectation within Montanism at this time.[123] At this time it stands out the more strongly because the Grosskirche has by this time become less eschatologically orientated.

This eschatological note sounded simultaneously by the new prophecy and *Epistula Apostolorum* may be bound up to the paschal practice which the two communities share. *Epistula Apostolorum* has a lively belief in the revelation of the Messiah in the paschal context.[124] If there is an eschatological element in Montanist fasting, as Kraft suggests,[125] then this would come to the fore in the paschal fast. The difference between Melito, whose speech makes present the risen Lord in the assembly and the *Epistula Apostolorum* which looks for a paschal revelation of the Messiah is only a difference of emphasis. One may easily see the (likewise Quartodeciman) new prophecy developing its eschatology in this framework and context.

Finally there is a degree of coherence between the views of the fate of the individual displayed by the Epistula and that of Montanus. *Epistula Apostolorum* 39, using Johannine language, states that the saints will become as sons of light. Similarly Montanus states that the just shall shine like the sun.[126] At *Epistula Apostolorum* 16 the same is said of Christ, though we should be cautious in pressing the parallels here, since there are many others scattered through Christian literature, collected by Hills.[127]

---

[121] Cf. Trevett, *Montanism* 100.

[122] Hornschuh, *Studien* 101.

[123] In particular the report of Firmilian at Cyprian, *Epistulae* 75.10. See further Aland, "Bemerkungen" 116-117.

[124] See especially Lohse, *Passahfest* 79-81.

[125] Kraft, "altkirchliche Prophetie" 258.

[126] Montanus, Oracle 4.

[127] Hills, *Tradition* 105. The background is scriptural. However, one should note that

4 *Conclusions*

There is then coherence between *Epistula Apostolorum* and the new prophecy, and between each of these with non-Montanist Asian Christianity, in the attitude to prophecy and its practice, to eschatology, to gnosticism, to christology and in paschal practice; much of this derives from a common Johannine background. All of this point to all three having a common, Asian point of origin. Montanism is in many ways a typical expression of Asian Christianity, and the *Epistula Apostolorum* belongs in the same circle, not in an entirely theoretical Egyptian-Roman circle of influence.

If a relationship between *Epistula Apostolorum* and Montanism in the setting of second century Asia is sustained on these bases, the question of the precise nature of the relationship then arises. Does *Epistula Apostolorum* antedate Montanism and thereby simply provide an illustration of the background in which Montanism grew up, like the social factors to which Williams draws our attention, or is it anti-Montanist, or even a product of the new prophecy?

Schmidt, whilst reckoning that the work is from the second half of the second century, believes that it precedes Montanism, since there is no discussion of ἐγκράτεια in the document.[128] Hornschuh suggests that it is a work of the first half of the second century, which would appear to be more probable, since prophecy may well have already been in decline at the time of the beginnings of Montanism,[129] and since after the rise of Montanism it would be difficult to be so liberal with texts and traditions which were in the process of becoming canonical. From whichever half of the second century the *Epistula Apostolorum* derives it predates Montanism; the work comes from the Grosskirche, yet is close enough to Montanism as to make its catholic origin unlikely were it to arise after the new prophecy.

As a pre-Montanist work from Asia *Epistula Apostolorum* provides a context for the movement; it is valuable evidence for the "proto-Montanism" which Trevett suggests existed before the confrontation of the new prophecy with "catholic" apologists.[130] This newly recognised evidence of the extent to which the new prophecy was in conformity with traditional Asian theology

---

the slightly strange statement implying different grades of salvation may be mirrored from Irenaeus *AH* 5.36. This has an Asian background, and may be further evidence of the degree of coherence between Montanism and normative Asian Christianity.

[128] Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* 382-3.

[129] Hornschuh, *Studien* 116-119. Much of the argument depends on *Epistula Apostolorum* 18 which gives a date for the parousia. However, the text is corrupt.

[130] Trevett, "Seeking the Seeds," and *Montanism* 39-42.

poses anew the vexed question of the grounds of the condemnation of the Montanists.

In conclusion it must be admitted that the nature of the argument presented here is cumulative rather than linear, but the striking similarities between the new prophecy, Asian Christianity and *Epistula Apostolorum* do serve to shed light upon one another, and so indicate an Asian origin to all three.

St. Matthew's Vicarage, 19 Widecomb Road, Birches Head, *Stoke on Trent*, ST1 6SL

REVIEWS

Jan Willem Drijvers and Alastair A. MacDonald (edd.), *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East.* Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 61. E.J. Brill, Leiden etc., 1995. xiv + 340 pp. Price HFl 181.50, $113.50.

This neatly produced volume records the papers of a conference held in 1993 inaugurating the Research school of Classical, Oriental, Medieval and Renaissance Studies (COMERS) at the University of Groningen. The 26 contributions are all of about the same length (10-15 pages) and on the whole succeed in giving an accessible presentation of their subject. The chronological range is vast: from Old Babylonia to Early Modern Groningen. But fortunately there is a connecting thread, the interaction between a "centre of learning" (a generic term covering every kind of setting in which knowledge is imparted and transmitted) and its concrete historical and geographical location.

Patristic scholars will be in the first place attracted to contributions on the "School" of Alexandria in the 2nd and 3rd centuries (R. van den Broek), the School of Edessa (H.J.W. Drijvers), and the School of Nisibis (G.J. Reinink), the last-named paper taking its starting point in that fascinating Syriac document *Cause of the Foundation of Schools* attributed (perhaps mistakenly) to Barḥadbšabba ʿArbaya, bishop of Ḥalwan. Methodologically there is an interesting difference in approach between the first two contributions mentioned above. Van den Broek is unabashedly minimalist, denying that there was anything resembling a real school with a succession in the 2nd century. Drijvers in contrast has a maximalist approach to his sources and argues that there already was a school at Edessa in the same century, even if "it might not have been an actual institution as in Alexandria" (p. 51). There must have been an interesting discussion at the conference after the presentation of these two contrasting views! Also the papers on early Medieval subjects are of interest for the study of the Fathers and the history of exegesis. Special mention should be made of the excellent contribution of Mayke de Jong on Hrabanus Maurus (788-856), Abbot of Fulda and Archbishop of Mainz. She concludes on the basis of his reading and application of the Old Testament that he was not so much an

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

astute theologian as a scholar and interpreter of divine law. Also deserving of mention is the intriguing paper by George Makdisi on the important question of the origin of the medieval universities. His argument is that one has to look at the legal and institutional basis for the difference between monastic and cathedral schools and the new universities, and that this basis lay precisely in the fact that the latter gained the *licentia docendi*, i.e. were given the prerogative of being licensed intellectuals. The origins of this innovation in the west he locates in already existent practice in Islam. The scholarly apparatus of this article, it must be said, is inadequate. For example, on pp. 151-2 there is a mildly polemical exchange with two opponents, both of whom remain unnamed.

Sadly the reviewer has to report that the volume lacks any kind of index, an unpardonable omission in a book of this sort. The editors, who presumably have to teach their students in the new Research school how to present the results of scholarly research, deserve a solid spanking for setting such a bad example.

NL-2333 AE *Leiden*, Rijnsburgerweg 116 D.T. Runia

Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 31. E.J. Brill, Leiden etc. 1996. 2 volumes, xvi + 1308 pp. HFl 467.50, $292.50.

The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*) falsely attributed to Philo of Alexandria hovers on the edge of Patristic studies. In its present form it is preserved in a Latin translation which is probably to be dated to the fourth century, and so was most likely made by a Christian rather than a Jew. From the ninth century onwards it circulated together with the Latin translation of some genuine works of Philo in the monasteries of Western Europe. There is no evidence of use of the work by the Fathers before this time. Its genre, an imaginative rewriting of the historical narrative of the Old Testament (or Hebrew Bible) up to the death of Saul differs from anything found in Patristic literature. But the subject matter of Old Testament history certainly is a shared feature. Readers of this journal will wish to be briefly informed about a magnificent new commentary on this work, which not only sheds fresh light on almost every line, but also encourages

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

us to reflect on highly interesting methological issues which arise when we deal with translated texts.

The original work was written in Hebrew by a devout Jew between 50 and 150 A.D. The Latin translation was not made directly from the Hebrew, however, but via a Greek intermediary translation. In-depth analysis of the extant work thus requires the following scholarly skills: detailed knowledge of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin languages; immersion in the Bible and biblical studies; profound knowledge of Inter-testamental Judaism (both in Hebrew and Greek), early Rabbinical writings and Targumic literature. One of the very few people to meet all these requirements is the writer of the work under review, Howard Jacobson, Professor of Classics and Comparative Literature at the University of Illinois at Urbana. He has used the knowledge and skills at his disposal to maximum effect.

At the beginning of the book Jacobson publishes the only fully critical text of *LAB* available, by D.J. Harrington in the Sources Chrétiennes series, followed by his own translation. After an extensive introduction covering all aspects of the work, a commentary of more than a thousand pages ensues. The translation deviates very considerably from all previous versions. For example in Chapter 19 on the death of Moses (less than a hundred lines of text) I counted no less than 26 major differences compared with the English translation of Harrington based on his own text in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth). Jacobson argues on the basis of countless examples that, in order to understand the original text, the interpreter has to take into account the mistakes and changes that occurred during the double translation process. So for every sentence he scrutinizes language and contents carefully, weighs up all relevant considerations and distills the result into his translation. In such cases the reviewer is wont to issue the warning that "this translation should be used with care." Such a remark would be quite inappropriate in the present case. No one could wish a more competent and knowledgable guide to all the difficulties this work presents us with. But it *is* important that whoever uses this work *does* understand the differing status of the text and translation. The former gives a critical edition of the transmitted text; the latter offers a reconstruction of the original work. And it has to be said that sometimes the translation incorporates solutions to problems which are quite tentative or even speculative (a good example at § 19.15 "on the one side there is a large black cloud" for the totally obscure *istic mel, apex magnus* in the text). Because Jacobson tries to go back to the original Hebrew

version, his solutions cannot be verified, since that original has totally vanished. Despite this measure of uncertainty, my recommendation is that his translation should be the starting-point for all further use of and research on this text.

As an illustration of the methodological difficulties posed by the work we might take its first two words *Initio mundi* (*Adam genuit tres filios . . .*), which Jacobson translates, counter-intuitively one might think, "The beginning of the world." Let us look at the problems involved. (1) The received text reads both *initio* and *initium*, with more mss. favouring the latter. In this case the words would represent a heading rather than a temporal indication (and there is other support for this in the indirect tradition). (2) But what did the Greek say? Did it read ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου or ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ κόσμου (a bald ἀρχῇ seems to me scarcely possible). (3) In any case, whatever the Greek said, it must have been rendering the original Hebrew, which was meant recall the opening phrase of Genesis. (4) An extra complication is the role of the Septuagint and the Vetus Latina translations of the Old Testament, which were doubtless familiar to the translators. These might furnish a clue here. Surely a Christian Latin translator who read ἐν ἀρχῇ in his original would render this with (*in*) *principio* rather than *initio*. This constitutes an additional argument in favour of the option chosen by Jacobson, i.e. the title, rather than the temporal phrase "In the beginning of the world Adam begot three sons . . ." which one would more naturally expect. But what the original work said we will never know for certain.

Exhaustive though this definitive work is, there are to my mind two aspects where further research might be yield interesting results. Firstly on pp. 254-7 pertinent observations are made on the various kinds of biblical quotation and paraphrase that occur in the work. Jacobson notes that *LAB* often recalls the biblical text from memory and so may make "small lapses." But because the author is "rewriting" the Bible it might be worth taking into account that he may wish to incorporate some deliberate *variatio* in his biblical quotations (which would be parallel to the way that later classical authors deal with authoritative texts; on the influence of Greco-Roman culture on the author see pp. 213-5). I also fail to see why it is "prima facie highly improbable" that the Greek translator should betray the influence of the LXX or other Greek translations in his version. It is wholly plausible in my view that the phraseology of the Greek Bible was so familiar to the translator that he unconsciously took over its wording when converting biblical texts. Secondly I wonder whether it might not be possible to make further advances in locating, either temporally or geogra-

phically, the Latin of the translation, especially if more detailed comparisons are made with the Latinity of the other fourth century translations (including those of Philo).

The presentation of the work is suitably monumental—two hefty volumes taking up nearly ten cm of shelf space. But the publisher could have been a bit more imaginative. The commentary is far too spaciously set out. Smaller print would still have been quite readable, and the whole work might have been limited to a mere thousand pages. And if two volumes were necessary, then why not text, translation and introduction in the one and commentary in the other? In all these respects the presentation (not the contents!) of the work compares unfavorably with Françoise Petit's edition and commentary (Berlin 1973) of the Latin translation of Philo's *Quaestiones in Genesim* (a work which is transmitted in the same manuscript tradition, but is less complex, because it only has a Greek, and not a Hebrew, *Vorlage*, and there is also an Armenian translation that can be used for comparative purposes).

NL-2333 AE *Leiden*, Rijnsburgerweg 116 D.T. RUNIA

David T. Runia (ed.), *The Studia Philonica Annual, Volume VIII*. Brown Judaic Series 309. Scholars Press, Atlanta 1996. Pp. viii + 228. Price $34.95.

ARTICLES: J. Whittaker, "The Terminology of the Rational Soul in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria" (1-20); K.L. Gaca, "Philo's Principles of Sexual Conduct and their Influence on Christian Platonist Sexual Principles" (21-39); F. Strickert, "Philo on the Cherubim" (40-57); C. Carlier, "Sur un Titre Latin du *De Vita Contemplativa*" (58-72).

SPECIAL SECTION: PHILO AND MYSTICISM: G.E. Sterling, "Introductory Notice" (73); D. Winston, "Philo's Mysticism" (74-82); B.E. Daley S.J., "Bright Darkness" and Christian Transformation: "Gregory of Nyssa on the Dynamics of Mystical Union" (83-98); E.R. Wolfson, "Traces of Philonic Doctrine in Medieval Jewish Mysticism: A Preliminary Note" (99-106).

INSTRUMENTA: J.R. Royse, "Yonge's Collection of Fragments of Philo" (107-121).

BIBLIOGRAPHY SECTION: D.T. Runia, A.C. Geljon, J.P. Martín, R. Radice, K.-G. Sandelin, D. Satran, D. Zeller, "Philo of Alexandria: an

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

Annotated Bibliography 1993" (122-142); Supplement: Provisional Bibliography 1994-96 (143-54).

REVIEW SECTION: Review article by D. Winston, "Aristobulus: From Walter to Holladay" (155-66); 15 reviews of monographs (167-214); News and notes (215-18); Notes on contributors (219-21); Instructions to contributors (222-28).

Jonathan A. Draper, *The Didache in Modern Research* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 37). E.J. Brill: Leiden etc. 1996. xviii + 445 pp. Price HFl 238.50, $149.50.

Preface by J.A. Draper (ix-x)

J.A. Draper, The *Didache* in Modern Research: An Overview (1-42); G. Schöllgen, The *Didache* as a Church Order: An Examination of the Purpose for the Composition of the *Didache* and its Consequences for its Interpretation (43-71); J.A. Draper, The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache* (72-91); C.M. Tuckett, Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache* (92-128); J.P. Audet, Literary and Doctrinal Relationships of the "Manual of Discipline" (129-147); W. Rordorf, An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic: the Two Ways (148-164); G. Alon, Halakah in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (*Didache*) (165-194); D. Flusser, Paul's Jewish-Christian Opponents in the *Didache* (195-211); W. Rordorf, Baptism according to the *Didache* (212-222); J.A. Draper, Christian Self-Definition against the "Hypocrites" in the *Didache* (223-243); J. Betz, The Eucharist in the *Didache* (244-275); E. Mazza, *Didache* 9-10: Elements of a Eucharistic Interpretation (276-299); A. de Halleux, Ministers in the *Didache* (300-320); K. Niederwimmer, An Examination of the Development of Itinerant Radicalism in the Environment and Tradition of the *Didache* (321-339); J.A. Draper, Torah and Troublesome Apostles in the *Didache* Community (340-363); E. Bammel, Pattern and Prototype of *Didache* 16 (364-372); H.R. Seeliger, Considerations on the Background and Purpose of the Apocalyptic Final Chapter of the *Didache* (373-382).

Bibliography (383-413); Indices (413-445).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

Reinhold Merkelbach, *Isis regina–Zeus Sarapis. Die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt.* B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart und Leipzig, 1995. XXVIII, 722 p.

The precise reasons for the rise of Christianity in the ancient world may be difficult to define, in any case it throve in the same religious climate as the cults of other originally non-Graeco-Roman gods, such as Isis and Mithras. The evidence of these cults is large and varied, providing the observer at least with the opportunity to gather more than superficial knowledge of the (social) surroundings of the adherents and the outline of the ritual and its meaning. But unfortunately, this evidence is not evenly spread. In the case of Mithras there is an exasperating lack of written sources pertaining to the "profile" and the myth of the god. Hence divergent views on the precise meaning of the rites. In contrast, Isis' impressive success can be far better understood because of the important texts which are available, above all the goddess' aretology, the contents of which are also visible in other invaluable texts, such as the hymns of a certain Isidorus inscribed on the piers of a temple excavated at Medinet Madi 60 years ago. Apuleius obviously was an expert in this field. The exact purport of the enigmatic 11th book of the *Golden Ass* is a subject of ongoing debate, but all and sundry cannot but acknowledge the author's detailed expertise. He fully knew what he was talking about.

Isis certainly has no reasons for complaint about scholarly attention paid to her. Modern monographs on aspects of her appearance and cult and on the spread of Isiac religion abound, reports on the provenance of her adherents can be consulted, summaries of more specific findings of research are available in *ANRW* II.17.3 and 4 and *LIMC V 1-2*, M. Totti has published a handy edition of the most relevant texts etc. Usually such studies also deal with Sarapis. Indeed, the importance of this god should by no means be underrated. He often appears with Harpokrates and Isis as a "holy family," he has many functions and is identified with various other gods and so on. However, his presence is less prominent and, remarkably, he hardly, if ever, plays a part in myths. Osiris, of course, does, but Sarapis is not identified with him.

R. Merkelbach now presents an extensive survey of "die Religion um Isis und Sarapis" in the same style as his well-know books on Mithras (Weinheim 1994[2]) and Dionysus (Stuttgart 1988): a large textual part,

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

divided into short sections, and a lavish selection of finely executed drawings and photographs illustrating the author's elucidations. Without doubt this strategy enhances the value of the rich and varied evidence which is put at the reader's disposal. This treasury of evidence testifies to M.'s expertise gathered in many years of scholarly interest in the subject. The main texts are presented, accompanied by M.'s interpretation and translation, and many data are provided. Secondary literature, however, receives a more modest place, which tallies with the personal character of this handbook, which even manifests itself in some idiosyncrasies. The author of the *Golden Ass* and the famous Alexandrinian theologian are consistently called Appuleius and Horigenes respectively; the poetical names of Tibullus' and Propertius' *dominae*, viz. "Delia" and "Cynthia," have been given them because they are "Isisdienerinnen," their names serving as a sign "dass der Isiskult aus Delos nach Italien eingeführt ist" (§ 323); "Der unpolitische Charakter der kaiserzeitlichen Isis- und Sarapis-Religion" (306) is a surprising expression in view of S. Takácz' recent study *Isis and Sarapis in the Roman World* (Leiden 1995). Other details could be added, but the most remarkable aspect of the book is its second part, "Die Isisromane" (335-484). Here it becomes clear that M. has remained faithful to a conviction he defended in his *Roman und Mysterium* (München 1962). In this detailed and thorough study he defended this position: "Die antiken Liebesromane hängen eng mit den Mysterien des sinkenden Altertums zusammen." This relationship was functional, the novels were the cults' sacred texts and the initiates understood the codes. It is clear "dass eine religiöse Deutung der genannten Romane unvermeidlich ist," thus M. now in § 564 of the book under review. As in 1962, he expounds this theory with scholarly expertise and spirited commitment. In its full form the theory has met with scepticism and indeed disbelief. Yet, as R. Beck has pointed out in a generous and thoughtful reappraisal in a chapter in G. Schmeling, *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden 1996) 131-150, "to set the novels alongside the mysteries as mutual comparators is a most fruitful line of criticism." Travel, descent, apparent death, salvation function both in the novels and the cults, with a comparable, but not a similar metaphorical sense. Presumably, such a parallelism would not satisfy M., who rather resorts to the idea that the novels can be read on two levels: "Die Erzähl-ebene und die religiöse Ebene." The well-know enigmatic phrase in the prologue of the *Golden Ass*, *desultoria scientia*, is an expression of this: the author announces that he will skip from one level to another. It remains to be seen whether such a hermeneutic key will really serve as a suitable instrument, but M.'s ingenuity and tenacity of purpose cannot but compel admiration.

Patristic scholars, of course, need to be acquainted with the different forms of pagan religiosity accompanying the rise of Christianity. In ch. 25 ("Regression") M. pays explicit attention to a comparison of this "success" with the final demise of the Egyptian gods. The priests of Isis and Sarapis looked to the past and lacked the capacity for real innovation. They failed to develop some sort of systematical theology, whereas the Christians "haben auf dem Fundament der 'Testamente' und philosophischer Gedanken der Griechen ein festes theologisches Gebäude errichtet" (317). After mentioning a few other advantages exploited by Christianity, M. concludes: "Alles in allem ist die christliche Religion die modernere gewesen" (318). Such reflections are worthwhile, even if M. tends to neglect crucial factors as the notable social care and the undoubtedly superior organization of the Church.

The author has published an invaluable textbook, which also merits the attention of all those engaged in patristic studies.

Universiteit Utrecht J. DEN BOEFT
Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bauer, Johannes B., *Studien zu Bibeltext und Väterexegese*, herausgegeben von Anneliese Felber (Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände 23). Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997. 296 pp. ISBN 3-460-06221-5. Price 79 DM.

Birnbaum, Ellen, *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes* (Brown Judaic Studies 290 = Studia Philonica Monographs 1). Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996. xviii + 262 pp. ISBN 0-7885-0182-8. Price $39.95.

Boulhol, Pierre, *'ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΜΟΣ: La scène de reconnaissance dans l'hagiographie antique et médiévale.* Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1996. 260 pp. ISBN 2-85399-387-6. Price FFr 170.

Castagno, Adele Monaci, *Il diavolo e i suoi angeli: testi e tradizioni (secolo I-III)* (Biblioteca Patristica 28). Firenze: Nardini Editore, 1996. 507 pp. Price 58,000 Lire.

Drobner, Hubertus R., *Archaeologia Patristica: Die Schriften der Kirchenväter als Quellen der Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte: Gregor von Nyssa, Homiliae in Ecclesiasten* (Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane 10). Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di archeologie cristiana, 1996. x + 254 pp. ISBN 88-85991-16-5. Price 120,000 Lire.

Évieux, Pierre (ed.), *Isidore de Péluse: Tome I, Lettres 1124-1413* (Sources Chrétiennes 422). Paris: Les éditions du CERF, 1997. 555 pp. ISBN 2-204-05557-3. Price 245 FFr.

Eymann, Hugo S. (ed.), *Vetus Latina: die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel; 21 Epistula ad Romanos, 1. Lieferung Einleitung.* Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1997. 80 pp. ISBN 3-451-00181-0.

Featherstone, J.M. (ed.), *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815* (Corpus Christianorum 33). Turnout: Brepols and Leuven: University Press, 1997. xxxiv + 380 pp. ISBN 2-503-40332-8. Price BFr 6500.

Gryson, Roger (ed.), *Vetus Latina: die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel; 12 (Pars II) Esaias, fascicule 9 Is 58,8-61,10.* Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1997. pp. 1441-1520. ISBN 3-451-00129-2.

Haas, Christopher, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. xviii + 494 pp. ISBN 0-8018-5377-X. Price $54.

Hoffmann, Andreas, *Augustins Schrift "De utilitate credendi": eine Analyse* (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 58). Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1997. vi + 497 pp. ISBN 3-402-03963-X. Price DM 118.

Jacob of Serugh: Select Festal Homilies, Translated from Syriac and introduced by Thomas Kollamparampil, CMI, with a foreword by Sebastian P. Brock. Rome: Centre for Indian and Inter-religious studies, and Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications: 1997. 414 pp.

Lévy, C., and Pernot, L. (eds.), *Dire l'évidence (Philosophie et rhétorique antiques)* (Cahiers de philosophie de l'Université de Paris XII—Val de Marne 2). Paris and Montreal: Editions l'Harmattan, 1997. 448 pp. ISBN 2-7384-5024-5.

Lössl, Josef, *Intellectus Gratiae: die erkenntnistheoretische und hermeneutische Dimension der Gnadenlehre*

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1997

Augustins von Hippo (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 38). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1997. xii + 501 pp. ISBN 90 04 10849 1. Price NLG 275.

Louth, Andrew, *Maximus the Confessor* (The Early Church Fathers, edited by Carol Harrison. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. ix + 230 pp. ISBN 0-415-11846-8. Price £14.99 (pb).

Luther, Andreas, *Die syrische Chronik des Josua Stylites* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 49). Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. v + 309 pp. ISBN 3-11-015470-6. Price 198 DM.

Maraval, Pierre, *Le christianisme de Constantin à la conquête arabe* (Nouvelle Clio: L'histoire et ses problèmes. Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 1997. lix + 460 pp. ISBN 2-13-048447-6. Price FFr 198.

Micaelli, Claudio, *Dio nel pensioro di Boezio* (Storie e Testi 4). Naples: M. D'Auria Editore, 1995. 185 pp. ISBN 88-7092-099-2.

Mirecki, Paul, and BeDuhn, Jason (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 43). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1997. x + 294 pp. ISBN 90 04 10760 6. Price NGL 186, $116.25.

Moxnes, Halvor (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor.* London and New York: Routledge, 1996. xvi + 216 pp. ISBN 0-415-1463-99. Price £14.99 (pb).

Prokurat, Michael; Golitzin, Alexander, and Petersen, Michael D. (eds.), *Historical Dictionary of the Orthodox Church* (Historical Dictionaries of Religions, Philosophies, and Movements 9). Lanham MD: Scarecrow Press, 1996. xvii + 440 pp. ISBN 0-8108-3081-7. Price $89.

Revista Theologica di Lugano: Anno II, numero 1 Maggio 1997. 167 pp. Price SFr 55.

Rufino di Aquileia Versione delle omelie di Basilio (I-III), edizione critica a cura di Carla Lo Cicero. Rome: Università Degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza": Dipartimento di Filologia Greca e Latina, 1996. xxxii + 78 pp.

Sant'Agostino Confessioni Volume V (Libri XII-XIII), Testo criticamente riveduto . . . a cura di Manlio Simonetti, Traduzione di Gioacchino Chiarini, Commento a cura di Jean Pépin, Manlio Simonetti (Scrittori Greci e Latini). Fondazione Lorenzo Valla Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1997. 393 pp. ISBN 88-04-41717-X. Price 48,000 Lire.

Sly, Dorothy I., *Philo's Alexandria.* London and New York: Routledge, 1996. xviii + 200 pp. ISBN 0-415-09679-0. Price £40.

Tabona: Revista de Preshistoria y de Arqueologia IX. Universidad de La Laguna (Tenerife): Servicio de Publicaciones, 1997. 437 pp. ISBN 0213-2818 (ISSN).

Turner, John D., and McGuire, Anne (eds.), *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years: Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 44). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1997. xviii + 531 pp. ISBN 90 04 10824 6. Price NLG 300.